THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCXX.] APRIL, 1863. [Vol. XIX.

PROTESTANT REFUGEES IN ENGLAND.

No. I. The Dutch Church.

The recent publication by Mr. William Durrant Cooper, in one of the volumes of the Camden Society, of "Lists of Foreign Protestants and Aliens resident in England, 1618—1688," has helped to fix our attention on an interesting chapter of ecclesiastical and general history which yet remains (in part at least) to be written; and we now propose, in a short series of articles, to put together, by the help of this volume and of various other works,* a few particulars respecting the foreign Protestants who found in the 17th century an asylum in our country. We will begin with the Dutch Protestants. The story of their persecutions at home has been recently impressively told by Mr. Motley in his Rise of the Dutch Republic and of the United Netherlands. The first fires kindled in the vain hope of suppressing the Reformation were lighted at Brussels in 1523. The Lutherans were forbidden by a succession of cruel edicts to meet for worship, for religious discussion, or for reading the Scriptures. Disobedience was death. "The fires were kept constantly supplied with human fuel by monks who knew the art of burning reformers better than that of arguing with them. The scaffold was the most conclusive of syllogisms, and used upon all occasions." In 1535, Romish fury seemed to have reached its climax. By an imperial edict which appeared at Brussels, all heretics were doomed to death; sturdy heretics were ordered to the fires; to repentant heretics the boon was granted—if males, of dying by the sword—if females, of being buried alive. For twenty years these horrible crimes continued

* We are bound in justice to name first in order, "The History of the French, Walloon, Dutch and other Foreign Protestant Refugees settled in England, from the Reign of Henry VIII. to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, &c., by John Southerden Burn." Our other authorities are, Strype's Annals and Life of Grindal; Froude's History of England; Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series; Krasinski's History of the Reformation in Poland; M. Young's Life and Times of Paleario; Neal's History of the Puritans; Zurich Letters and Original Letters relative to the English Reformation (Parker Society); Collier's Church History; Calvin's Letters; W. Torrens M'Cullagh's Industrial History of Free Nations; Wallace's Antitrinitarian Biography; the Biographical Dictionary of the Society of Useful Knowledge; and Motley's History of the Netherlands.

to be perpetrated in the Netherlands in the name of Religion. We need not wonder that such as had the means of doing so fled to England.

Materials for the history of the Dutch refugees in England are not largely supplied to us prior to the reign of Edward VI. Their early history is closely connected with that of John à Lasco, a Polish nobleman with royal blood in his veins, who had devoted himself to the reformation of religion, and had become preacher to a Protestant church at Embden, in East Friesland. His learning, rank and virtues gained him the friendship of Cranmer, who invited him to England in July, 1548, wishing to consult with him, Melancthon and other distinguished foreigners, on a scheme for the agreement of all Protestants in an entire system of true doctrine, which he hoped might prevent future religious controversies. He offered to provide for the expenses of the journey, and to make their residence in England as agreeable as possible. A Lasco presently accepted the invitation, arriving in London in the month of September. He spent six months with Cranmer at Lambeth, and was during that time, in the opinion of John Ab Ulmis,* the instrument by which the Archbishop was rescued from some serious errors on the subject of the real presence. On leaving Lambeth, à Lasco returned to Embden; but the introduction of the *Interim*† necessitated his early withdrawal from Friesland. He removed first to Bremen and then to Hamburg. A visit to his native Poland, where he proposed conferring with the King on the state and prospects of religion, resulted in disappointment. The bishops induced the King to decline seeing him. Baulked at home in his "godly desires," he once more turned his thoughts to England. Receiving assurances of protection and aid from Cranmer, Cecil and Somerset, he came a second time to this country in the spring of 1550. Latimer had during his absence mentioned him honourably in one of his sermons preached before the King, and deplored the retirement from England of so valiant a lover of religious truth. A Lasco was enabled to render the most important services to the Dutch and other refugees, who had by this time reached England in considerable numbers. He received from the King the appointment of Superintendent-general of the foreign churches in London.

"From city and village" (in the Low Countries), says Mr. Froude, "streams of refugees poured out towards the ports, and on board vessels bound for England. England became the island of refuge to which the exiled Flemings brought with them their arts and industry, and as for-

---

* See his letter to Bullinger printed in the "Original Letters relative to the English Reformation," p. 383.

† The *Interim* was a system of doctrine based on the tenets of the Church of Rome. It took its name from the circumstance that the regulations contained in it were only to continue in force until a general council could be held.

lorn and naked they set foot upon the British shores, the honourable humanity with which they were received, sheltered and sustained, must be counted among the not too many virtues of Edward's ministers." *Hist. of England,* Vol. V. p. 300.

The ancient church of the Augustine Friars in London was assigned to à Lasco and his flock. They were erected into a corporation, and 380 of the congregation were made denizens of England. In addition to this, Mr. Froude states that lands and farms were set apart to sustain the clergy of the exiled Protestants.* In the patent of incorporation, the King commanded the authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, to permit these strangers to "enjoy and exercise their own proper rites and ceremonies, and their own proper and peculiar ecclesiastical discipline, though differing from the rites and ceremonies used in the kingdom, without impediment, let or disturbance." These privileges were not won without difficulty, nor were they enjoyed without intermission. Ridley, the Bishop of London, opposed and resented the permission granted to the strangers to use forms and ceremonies different from those of the Church of England. Cranmer, not a little to their surprise, stood their friend. The church of the Augustine Friars was cleansed, repaired and beautified for their use at the expense of the King. The alterations proceeded, in the estimation of the intending worshipers, slowly. They asked permission to use the church in its imperfect state, but were told by the Lord Treasurer it would be a slight on the King, whose gift the church was, to attempt to use it before it was handsomely decorated. The Lord Treasurer was the mouthpiece of the bishops who were unfriendly to the foreigners. In one of the interesting letters illustrative of the Reformation printed by the Parker Society, the substance of the conversation between à Lasco and the Lord Treasurer is thus given:

"Speaking also upon our liberty in respect to ceremonies, he inquired why we chose to have them different from the English, since the English ones are not repugnant to the word of God. At last, when they had talked a good deal about ceremonies, the treasurer concluded by stating, that we foreigners must either adopt the English ceremonies, or disprove them by the word of God. All this mischief is stirred up against us by the bishops, and especially by the bishop of London, who does us the more harm, in proportion as he seems more actively to support the word of God."—II. 569.

In the mean time certain citizens of London gave to the foreigners the temporary use of a church, in which Martin Micronius began to conduct religious service, Sept. 21. The congregation proved numerous beyond the capacity of the building to accommodate them.

* This statement is scarcely justified by the patent: the *solum* and *fundum* mentioned therein refer, probably, to the land on which the church stood, and the garden by which it was surrounded.

"When we perceived" (wrote Micronius to Bullinger in a letter dated Oct. 13, 1550) "this happy condition of our church, a consultation took place among our countrymen as to the establishment of a regular plan of government. Therefore, on the 5th of this month, we appointed four elders according to the apostolic ordinance, to assist the minister, not indeed in the ministry of the word, but in the conservation of doctrine and morals in the church. The most illustrious master John Utenhovius is one of the number. They were inaugurated with public prayer and imposition of hands. On the twelfth of this month we in like manner ordained four deacons, to take the charge of the poor and exiled for Christ's sake. The same ceremony was altogether adopted which the apostles observed with their deacons. The multitude of believers (praised be God!) is increasing every day. Should we be permitted, by God's blessing, to go on in this way for some years, we shall attack our Flanders with fiery darts, and, I hope, take it by storm, that, antichrist being put to flight or at least weakened, our Saviour may reign there." II. 570, 571.

In the month of August, 1551, Micronius reports:

"We have established in our church a collation of scripture in the German language, in which are discussed the sermons of the preceding week, to preserve the purity of doctrine; and this arrangement, in some measure, represses the heretical, and confirms the ignorant in the Christian doctrine. We have, besides, in our German church, two other lectures in Latin; one by master à Lasco, the other by master Walter Delvin; after which there takes place a comparison of scriptures on the subject of the lectures last delivered, to the great advantage of the churches. Thus we have three collations of scripture every week, whereas at first we had only determined to have two. One thing in particular is still wanting in our church, namely, the administration of baptism and of the Lord's supper. Liberty is granted us by the royal licence, but we are prevented by the malevolence of certain individuals from the enjoyment of so great a benefit. Master à Lasco is indeed diligently exerting himself with the bishops, as his duty requires him to do, that we may be permitted to enjoy the liberty that has been conceded to us; but all his exhortations are without any effect. I fear we shall have to wait till the meeting of parliament, and I know not when that will take place."—II. 575.

The hostile influence of the Bishop of London was felt in other ways by the Dutch church, and was sufficiently strong to make even the King's patent of doubtful authority. Some of the members had settled themselves in Southwark, others in St. Katharine's by the Tower. The churchwardens, resenting their non-appearance at the parish church, threatened the strangers with ecclesiastical penalties and even imprisonment. A Lasco appealed by letter to Cecil, and supplicated that the troubled members of his flock might have a warrant from the King's Council as a protection for the future. The appeal was backed by the Lord Chancellor, Goodrich, Bishop of Ely, and was, we may suppose, successful.

But still more serious were the internal troubles of the church

of Austin Friars. These arose from differences of opinion which were of long standing.

One or two passages from the letters of Micronius, the orthodox pastor of the Dutch church, will shew what doctrinal divisions prevailed or were suspected to exist amongst the strangers.

"Master John à Lasco arrived in England on the 13th of May. His coming was greatly to the delight of all godly persons. He has determined to remain in London, and establish a German church, of which he is appointed the superintendent. And indeed it is a matter of the first importance that the word of God should be preached here in German, to guard against the heresies which are introduced by our countrymen. There are Arians, Marcionists, Libertines, Danists, and the like monstrosities, in great numbers. A few days since, namely, on the 2nd of May, a certain woman was burnt alive for denying the incarnation of Christ."—II. 560.

This was written in 1550. In the following year he writes (August 14) to Bullinger:

"We have need of help in the present difficulty of our affairs. We, who are desirous to hand down to the churches the sincere doctrine of God, are attacked on every side. We have not only to contend with the papists, who are almost every where ashamed of their errors, but much more with the sectaries and Epicureans and pseudo-evangelicals. In addition to the ancient errors respecting pædobaptism, the incarnation of Christ, the authority of the magistrate, the [lawfulness of an] oath, the property and community of goods, and the like, new ones are rising up every day, with which we have to contend. The chief opponents, however, of Christ's divinity are the Arians, who are now beginning to shake our churches with greater violence than ever, as they deny the conception of Christ by the Virgin. Their principal arguments may be reduced under three heads: The first is respecting the unity of God, as declared throughout all the scriptures both of the Old and New Testament; and that the doctrine, as well as the name, of the Trinity is a novel invention, as not being mentioned in any part of scripture. Their next argument is this: the scripture, they say, which every where acknowledges one God, admits and professes that this one God is the Father alone (Joh. xvii. 3), who is also called one God by Paul (1 Cor. viii. 6). Lastly, they so pervert the passages which seem to establish the divinity of Christ, as to say that none of them refer intrinsically to Christ himself, but that he has received all from another, namely, from the Father (Joh. v. Matt. xxviii.); and they say that God cannot receive from God; and that Christ was only in this respect superior to any of mankind, that he received more gifts from God the Father.

"I have replied to these things as God has enabled me, and (thank the Lord!) master à Lasco, who is, next to God, the principal defender of our church, affords me his assistance. I was desirous, however, to lay these things before your reverence, that, should you have leisure, you may be pleased to write me word what may most fitly be replied to these three arguments of the enemies of Christ; for from your decade, wherein you most solidly establish his divinity upon other grounds, I have been able to elicit little or nothing which may be satisfactorily brought against

them. You, who are our fathers, teachers, and guides in the reformation of the churches, will not grudge affording us your advice and instruction, that we may rightly direct the church of God, and fortify it against all heresies."—II. 574, 575.

A Lasco was probably orthodox, as his soundness in faith is attested by Melancthon and others. But his sympathies were large and free. In his own country he took (though at a later period of his life) a share in the translation of the Bible into the Polish language, the majority of his coadjutors in that important work being Unitarians. In this country he sided with the Puritan party against the bishops on the question of ecclesiastical vestments, and approved of sitting rather than kneeling at the Lord's Supper.* But the heresy which developed itself in the Dutch church almost immediately after its establishment in London, presently involved it and the authorities of both Church and State in England in the worst crime of persecution. George Van Parris, one of its members, by profession a surgeon, had come from Mentz, in the Grand Duchy of Hesse. Pure and almost ascetic in life, he was also devotional in his habits. Neither his virtue nor his piety could, however, atone to his countrymen and others for his theological opinions, for he professed his belief that the Father was the only Object of worship, and that Christ was not God. The Dutch church excommunicated him, and he was handed over to an English ecclesiastical commission, composed of Cranmer, Ridley, Coverdale, Sir John Cheke and others.

"Van Parris" (says Mr. Wallace, in Antitrinitarian Biography, II. 126), "if we are to believe Fox, was acquainted with no language but his own mother-tongue,—not even with that, in which sentence of condemnation was pronounced against him; and being unable to speak for himself, his examination was carried on through the medium of an interpreter. This interpreter was Miles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter. Through him Van Parris declared his belief, that it is no heresy to call God the Father the only God, or to say that Christ is not very God; and on being told, that it *was* heresy, and asked whether he would retract, and abjure it, he answered in the negative. After many attempts to shake his resolution, the Commissioners at length pronounced him an obstinate heretic; delivered him over to the secular power; and petitioned the King for his execution, declaring him at the same time to be 'a child of the Devil, and an enemy of all righteousness.'

"Great intercessions were made for him, but in vain. His sentence

* It is, however, right to mention that à Lasco's name appears in the Commission which recommended to Parliament the Reformatio Legum, usually attributed to Cranmer, a document which specified and extended the heresies which were punishable (the punishments being more worthy of the Inquisition than of a Protestant Commission); the list including the denial of the inspiration of the Bible, or of the inspiration of the Old Testament, and of the two natures in Christ. Persecuting Bishops and Churchmen in our day at Salisbury and Oxford have felt the want of a power such as the Reformatio Legum proposed to erect for the suppression of heresy.

was carried into execution at Smithfield, April 25th, 1551: and he suffered with great constancy, kissing the stake, and the faggots, which were to burn him."

The condemnation of this stranger is thus recorded in the Diary of King Edward's Journal: "1551, April 7. A certain Arrian, of the strangers, a Dutch man, being excommunicated by the congregation of his countrymen, was, after long disputation, condemned to the fire." The tone of this entry is not unlike that in which the King records the death the year before of Joan Bocher, of Kent,* and forces us to distrust the story (a story disputed on other grounds) which the panegyrists of Edward tell of his pathetic agony when called upon to sign the death-warrant of the first of these two heretics. These incidents are ineffaceable blots on the repute of the early reformers and of their idolized "Josiah," the term by which they loved to speak of the young King; they give too much force to the remark of the latest historian of this period, that "the doctrine of persecution is an essential part of all dogmatic systems."

A Lasco lost his wife during his residence in England, but found consolation in a second marriage.

The death of Edward VI., followed by the accession of Mary, brought a sad change over the prospects of the reformed churches in England. The refugees were again compelled to fly in search of a home. How wide-spread the terror and misery were consequent on Mary's accession and the dispersion of the foreign Protestants, we may gather from the fact, stated in a letter of Bullinger, of the date August 26, 1553, that there were more than 15,000 foreigners attached to the reformed religion resident in London. Well might Calvin say in his reply, "What is to become of so great a multitude of pious men, who have betaken themselves to voluntary exile in that country?"

A Lasco embarked, September 15, 1553, at Gravesend, with nearly 200 of his flock, resolved to share the fortunes of their pastor. The ship, driven out of its course by a storm, entered the port of Elsinore, in Denmark. A Lasco waited on the King of Denmark, and the favourable audience accorded to him inspired his flock with the hope of receiving a hospitable reception among the Danes. But the Lutheran clergy, headed by Noviomagus, the King's chaplain, a narrow and intolerant man, raised popular odium against the unfortunate strangers. One of the Lutheran divines called them "martyrs of the devil;" another denounced them as not Christians. In reply to an appeal to à Lasco to abandon his heresy, he presented to the King an apology

* "Joan Bocher, otherwise called Joan of Kent, was burnt for holding that Christ was not incarnate of the Virgin Mary, being condemned the year before, but kept in hope of conversion: the 30th April, the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Ely were to persuade her, but she withstood them, and reviled the preacher that preached at her death."—Edward's Journal.

for his religious opinions, which increased rather than diminished the odium theologicum of the Lutheran clergy. Eventually à Lasco and his flock received an intimation that the King would rather tolerate Papists than them in his dominions, and they were forced, notwithstanding tempestuous weather, to re-embark and seek a place of refuge elsewhere. An exception was made in favour of à Lasco's children, who were permitted to remain at Elsinore for a time. A similar spirit of intolerance drove others of à Lasco's flock from Hamburg, Lubeck and Rostock. At last the wanderers found a resting-place at Dantzic. A Lasco received from Gustavus Vasa an invitation (including also his flock) to settle in Sweden, where he was assured perfect religious liberty awaited him. But he declined the invitation, and returned to his friends at Embden, who received him with every demonstration of satisfaction and love.

On the approach of à Lasco and his friends, the Princess Anne of Oldenburg went out to meet them, presented them with liberal gifts, and gave them permission to have two churches of foreigners at Embden, one English and the other French. The establishment of the former appears to strengthen the evidence for the story, that some of the English Marian exiles took the opportunity of escaping from their country by assuming the appearance and acting the part of servants of the Dutch and other strangers.

The troubles of à Lasco and his companions at Elsinore procured for him a letter from Calvin full of impassioned eloquence:

"The narrative of your wanderings so afflicted me with grief and sadness that I easily perceived that the events were nevertheless exceedingly worthy of being recorded. . . . . The information respecting the cruelty of the Danes was exceedingly painful and saddening to me. Good God! that the barbarity of a Christian people should exceed even the sea in savageness. When the rumour got afloat that a signal had been raised by that king to our unfortunate brethren who, exiled from England, were in search of a new place of retreat, so sudden was our joy that this single act was sufficient to win for him immortal honour. But I now fear that he has brought down upon himself the bitter vengeance of God, no less than kindled the deep indignation of all good men. And I feel it all the more keenly for his mild disposition to have been inflamed by unfortunate instigators, seeing that I had taken such a lively interest in celebrating, yea, in publicly proclaiming his generosity. The perfidy of those who ought even to have smoothed down hostility was no less detestable than their cruelty. It seems to me, however, that a diabolical fury has seized on almost the whole of that maritime region, and has swept over Saxony and the adjoining countries, so that they shew neither bounds nor shame in their mad rage against us. You may rely upon it that it has been a joyful and pleasant spectacle to the Papists.* I

* It doubtless was, and so was the tragedy at Champel of which Calvin was the merciless instigator. Strange that he should not perceive how his words applied to himself! The "diabolical fury" which actuated Protestant persecu-

think that you have set an example doubly praiseworthy, in that yourself and your companions have contended with the savage ferocity and haughtiness of that beast with no less calm discretion and composed dignity, and have besides preserved the same even tenor of moderation as often as others of a similar character have turned their cruel attacks against you. So noble indeed has been your defence of truth that, already tossed about roughly both by sea and land, you have not thought it a hardship again to undergo a new exile for its cause, and by this steadfastness you have offered alike a sweet sacrifice to God and set a useful example to all pious men."

He hoped to devote his remaining years to the consolidation of the reformed religion in Friesland, but his prospects were again darkened by Lutheran intolerance. He retired for a short time to Frankfort-on-the-Maine, where he established a church for the Belgian Protestant refugees. He believed that the dissensions of the Reformed and Lutheran churches were a serious obstacle to the progress of the Reformation, and he earnestly sought, but with little success, to bring about a reconciliation between them. The evening of his life was passed in his native country. He there received the office of Superintendent of the Protestant churches in Little Poland, and devoted himself with his accustomed energy to the promotion of the Protestant faith. He died in 1560, being about sixty-one years of age. Most of the books which he published are unfortunately lost. One of them contained a history of the foreign churches over which he had presided, entitled, "Forma ac Ratio Ecclesiastica Ministerii."

A Lasco is, we conceive, entitled to one of the highest places of honour amongst the reformers. His zeal was pure, his temper candid, and his spirit remarkably catholic. If he did not reach truth on all subjects, he held with a firm grasp some very important theological principles. "He maintained," says Count Krasinski,* "that the Gospels alone were the true foundation of religious doctrine and of the ecclesiastical discipline, and that neither tradition, nor long-established custom could have any authority whatever; that even the evidence of the Fathers of the Church was not decisive, as they have frequently expressed opinions widely differing one from another." On the subject of the interpretation of scripture, he was in advance of his age, arguing that scripture cannot be expounded, and that its meaning ought not to be extended, by expressions entirely foreign to its spirit; and he held that in this matter councils

tors was not confined to Saxony and Denmark. It had borne its deadly fruits in preceding years at Geneva and in England. That Calvin could praise the "discretion" and "moderation" which he did not imitate, abates the plea in his behalf in relation to the death of Servetus, that he acted only up to his light in that dreadful business.

* Count Valerian Krasinski's History of the Reformation in Poland (Vol. I. ch. v.) contains the best account we have of the labours and opinions of à Lasco.

and learned divines had laid themselves open to censure. It was one of the happy circumstances of à Lasco's life that he enjoyed the friendship of Erasmus. Of no one did that distinguished scholar and genius speak with more marked respect or with warmer affection. A Lasco was enabled to minister to the wants of his friend when living, and on his death became the possessor by purchase of his library, paying for it 300 golden crowns.

When the accession of Elizabeth to the throne again turned the eyes of foreign Protestants to England as a desirable home, the event did not affect the position of à Lasco, for it did not meet the views of the rulers of the English Church that the kind of episcopal authority which he had exercised should be in the hands of any one not connected with or subject to the English hierarchy. The care and inspection of the foreign churches was therefore vested in Grindal, Bishop of London. The Dutch exiles soon returned, and in considerable numbers, to London. They found the church of the Augustine Friars turned to secular and military uses. But by the influence of the Bishop, the church was again made over to them, and the Queen's purveyor received instructions to remove the stores with which it had been filled, and to cleanse it and make it once more fit as a place of worship for the exiles. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners renewed and confirmed the privileges awarded to the church by the last King. The principal minister was John Utenhovius, a man of noble rank, from Ghent, who had served the church under à Lasco, and was the intimate friend of Bishop Hooper and Bullinger. He is described by Hooper as "a man illustrious both by his birth and virtues, most sincere in the true religion, and entirely opposed to all the mischiefs of sectarianism." Hooper speaks also of his "noble qualities and remarkable learning." There were united with him three other ministers, Peter de Loene, Godfrey Wyng and Hadrian Hamsted.

Towards foreign Protestants, Elizabeth extended a degree of toleration which she habitually and sternly refused to her own native Puritan subjects. In a letter, in 1560, to the exiles who had sought shelter under her sway, she wrote thus admirably: "We are not ignorant that the ceremonies, &c., have been different in the various churches since the birth of Christianity; in some, the congregation prayed standing; in others, kneeling; *it is nevertheless the same religion, provided their prayers are addressed to the same God. We* do not despise *your* service, and we do not constrain you to adopt *ours*. We approve of your ceremonies, inasmuch as they accord best with the countries whence you come."

Before proceeding to speak of the theological differences and troubles that arose in the returned Dutch church, it is desirable to speak of the occupations of the settlers, and of the great accessions they made to the national wealth of England. In seeking

a new home for his Dutch friends, à Lasco truly said that they would benefit and enrich the country that received them. He might have appealed to the experience of our countrymen in this matter, for, in fact, most of the staple trades had been established or greatly augmented and improved by the skill and industry of the Dutch settlers who came over to England in the reign of Edward III. To them, Norwich owed its manufacture of fustians; Sudbury, of baizes; and Colchester, its sayes and serges; to them, the counties of Kent, Gloucester, Worcester and York, Hants, Berks and Sussex, owed their success in the manufacture of woollen cloth; Westmoreland, its Kendal cloth; Somerset, its Taunton serges; Wales, its friezes; and to them, Lancashire owed the beginning of that manufacture of cotton which has since developed into so mighty a trade. Until the fourteenth century, the civilized world derived its supply of cloth from the Belgians and Flemings. Whatever skill the native English manifested in husbandry and sheep-keeping, or the less profitable art of war, they shewed little in those manufactures and handicraft works which have latterly swollen to so great an extent our national resources. Long after the English people had adopted the manufacture of woollen cloth, they continued to send the cloth to Holland and Belgium to be dyed. It was the shrewd wit and patriotism of William Cholmley which gained from Flemish workmen the secret of the art of dyeing, and transferred it to the banks of the Thames. Long since his prediction was fulfilled, that "the trade of Antwerp would droop, and London would become the mart of Europe." It was a Dutchman, one Guilliam Boonen, who, in 1564, introduced into this country private coaches. The Queen adopted the luxurious conveyance, making Boonen her coachman; the fashion thus royally set was quickly followed by the wealthy dames of London, "who made them coaches and rid in them up and down the countries, to the great admiration of all the beholders." Boonen's wife was the first who starched the Queen's cambric ruffs, and presently fabulous sums were earned by a Flanders lady who taught the mystery of clear-starching. The Dutch refugees gave a great start to the manufacture in England of glass, gloves, wire, hats and clocks. They taught the gardeners of the suburbs to grow salads and other palatable vegetables. Certain Flemings were advantageously employed at the Mint of Queen Elizabeth, and improved the character of English coinage. It was to be expected that some of the emigrants from Holland would introduce into this country improvements in draining fen lands. A native of Germany helped our miners to improvements in draining mines. Dutchmen were the first great improvers of London water-works. To a Dutchman named Spillman, the first paper-mill in Kent on a large scale is ascribed. His praises were rudely sung by his contemporary, Thomas Churchyard:

"Six hundred men are set at work by him
That else might starve or seeke abroad their bread;
Who nowe live well, and go full brave and trim,
And who may boast *they* are with paper fed."

In the reign of James the First, a return was ordered of the numbers and names of foreigners employed in the different trades. These are the numbers of the principal trades and callings:—weavers, 349; merchants, 183; tailors, 148; sleeve-makers, 64; shoemakers, 43; dyers, 39; brewers, 37; diamond-cutters, 25; jewellers, 35; cutlers, 22; goldsmiths, 20; silk-throwsters, 12.

There were Dutch emigrants in various parts of England. At Norwich they filled up the desolate void caused by Kett's rebellion, and introduced the manufacture of crape, bombazine and bays. Others of them were known as gardeners, and enriched the pleasure-grounds of Norfolk, and soon of England generally, by the introduction of carnations, the Provence rose, and other choice flowers previously unknown in England. Some were potters, and manufactured, amongst other articles, those Dutch tiles which formed such conspicuous ornaments in the huge fire-places in which our forefathers delighted. To a Dutchman, Norwich owed its first printing-press, and the citizens did themselves honour by presenting, in 1570, Anthony Solen, the first printer amongst them, with the freedom of their city. At Yarmouth, the Dutch strangers introduced the art of curing the fish caught in such vast shoals on that coast, and received a patent of protection from Queen Elizabeth. At Colchester, the strangers introduced the manufacture of bays and sayes, which were, we believe, woollen stuffs, open and with a long nap. They are named as exotics previous to the sixteenth century, in the old rhyme,

"Hops, reformation, bays and beer,
Came into England all in a year."

Wherever they settled in great numbers, they established breweries.* Others manufactured sackcloth, needles, parchment. So great was the prosperity introduced into Colchester by the industry and enterprize of the settlers, that not a house was to be had at any price, and the race of beggars, so abundant in most English towns under the Tudors, was for a time almost extinguished there. It may be mentioned as a creditable fact that the strangers generally were careful to keep their own poor, and were on this account in some cases exempt from parochial rates. At Bocking and Halstead there were manufacturing establishments conducted by the Dutch. Certain State Papers have recently

* In the State Papers (Vol. XXVIII. No. 136) appear the names of Dutchmen using the art and mystery of brewing within and about the city of London, *with their advantages in trade over the English.* In the matter of hops, introduced into England from the Netherlands in 1524, a panic presently arose. They were denounced as an "unwholesome and wicked weed" by the physicians of 1528, and their use was temporarily forbidden. What fortunes have been since that day gathered out of English hops, cultivated in sixty or seventy thousand acres!

been brought to light in the useful process of calendaring, which throw a little light on this rural manufacturing colony. In 1576, a proposal was made to the Council to sanction the removal of the Dutch strangers from Colchester to Halstead. In the following year the removal of forty families took place, and in the course of two or three years the new trade flourished not only at Halstead, but at Castle Headingham, Little Maplestead and other places. In 1580, from some cause which does not appear, the exiles returned to Colchester. The consequences were calamitous to the districts which they had quitted, and petitions flowed in to the Council from eight towns, in which the petitioners alleged that the discontinuance of the manufacture of bays had greatly impoverished the people, and prayed for an order for their return.

Another Dutch settlement was formed on the coast of Essex, in a district little known even to English travellers. About five miles north-west from the Nore, there lies at the mouth of the Thames the island of Canvey, about five miles long and two broad. Three centuries ago it was submerged by every spring tide. A Dutchman named Joas Croppenburgh, skilled in draining and protecting fen lands, undertook to recover this land from the ocean for the consideration of the fee-simple of one-third of the recovered land. We find in the State Papers for 1628, a petition to the King from two hundred "poor Low Country strangers" employed in manuring and tilling the ground in Canvey island. They allege their want of spiritual comfort and divine service in their own language, and pray that their interests may be regarded by the Bishop of London. The King granted their request on the condition that the ministers and services were conformable to the Dutch church in London. A Dutch church of very humble architectural character still may be seen on the island. The labours of Croppenburgh were destroyed in 1731 by an inundation of the Thames, which swept over every part of the island and destroyed all the living farm stock. The land is now protected by sea walls, for the repair of which one-third of the land is appropriated.

There was a Dutch colony formed in the 16th century at Stamford, in Lincolnshire, of which Strype gives us some account.

"And this by the motion of Lord Burleigh, to whom the town chiefly belonged, well knowing what good profit and benefit might redound unto the place and country by the trades and business these men should bring along with them, by taking off the wools at a good price, and encouraging the sowing of flax and hemp, improving land and such like. For they were for the most part weavers of such sorts of cloths as were not yet wove and made (or very rarely) in England, as bays and says, and stammets, fustians, carpets, linsey woolseys, fringes, tapestry, silks and velvets, figured and unfigured linen. There were also among them

dyers, rope-makers, hatters, makers of coffers, knives, locks, workers in steel and copper, and the like, after the fashion of Nuremberg in Germany."

One remarkable fact connected with this colony was their petition to have seven men chosen out of their own number who should exercise magisterial functions in cases affecting the members of the colony: where they could not agree, they were to call in the aid of two of the magistrates of the town. At Norwich and Sandwich a similar privilege was conceded to the strangers. Maidstone also had its colony of toiling Dutchmen, who planted there the manufacture of thread. Hasted mentions that the common people in his day called the flax spun for the thread-man, *Dutch-work*. In the reign of Charles I., about fifty families of the strangers were in the town.

Sandwich and the other Cinque Ports were places of settlement to the Dutch. The former town was three centuries ago the great harbour on that coast for receiving foreign ships. It was the most ancient of the Dutch colonies in England. When Queen Elizabeth visited the town in 1573, the Dutch inhabitants contributed their quota to the pageant prepared in her honour. More than 100 children were placed on a lofty platform, engaged in "spynning of fyne bay yarne, a thing well lyked both of her Majestie and of the nobilletie and ladies." The Dutch inhabitants amused the Queen and court by a rude sea-fight, carried on between men in boats, armed with staves and shields, who struck fiercely one at the other. The blows sometimes felled the warriors, and they disported themselves in the water as easily as if it were their habitual element.

There are traces in books and old documents of Dutch settlers at Hastings, Lynn, Dover, Thetford and other places; but we are not aware of any visible traces of their settlement remaining in the towns themselves. There was also a parish in Norfolk which was very early in our history inhabited by Flemings. There they set up the manufacture of woollen twists and stuffs. Hence *Worstead* gave its name to what has become a most important class of woollen cloths, and the source of large profits in many parts of the British dominions.

The introduction of Dutch looms, an important era in the history of the cotton manufacture, was effected by some Flemish artizans, and their principal settlement was at Bolton-le-Moors. This fact is mentioned in the recently published volume of the Chetham Miscellanies, where it is stated that those who adopted the Dutch looms had an advantage over the old English loom. The shuttle was thrown and caught by the hands of the weaver. These looms continued to be used until the invention of Kay's fly-shuttle, patented in 1733.

The recital of facts like these is important. It illustrates the close connection that exists between religious liberty and national

prosperity. How magnificent have been the material results alone to England of its hospitable reception of industrious foreigners driven from their homes by civil distractions and religious persecution! In the thirteenth century, Matthew of Westminster somewhat rhetorically asserted that all the world was clothed by English wool wrought in Flanders by the weavers of that country. In the following century began the immigration into England of the industrious and skilful Flemings. Edward the Third, who has been styled the Father of English Commerce, invited the manufacturers of Holland, worried by some of their corporate bodies, to settle in England. Later in our history, England won from foreign Protestants the title of Asylum Christi, by giving a home and place of trade to those whose industry was disturbed and whose rights were invaded by religious intolerance. And the result which we now behold is that England is by means of its manufactures and commerce bidding for a large share of the trade of the world. It now not only weaves its own wool, but exports that precious staple and millions of bales of cotton in addition from every quarter of the globe, and aims to become the clothiers of every nation, whether civilized or savage, on the face of the globe.

The Dutch strangers were not indeed allowed to enjoy their immunities here without interruption. They interfered with much native trade and many vested interests. As it had been in the Low Countries, so it proved here. The Corporations, which were erected as barriers to protect trade, became in the course of time its worst hindrances, shewing, as Mr. Hallam has well remarked, "that political institutions have very frequently but a relative and temporary usefulness." (Middle Ages, chap. ix. pt. ii.) Then, in other places, popular tumults arose on the part of those whose employment was lost or injured by the superior skill or greater industry of emigrant competitors. It cost successive governments, during two centuries or more, no little trouble to protect the strangers from "the selfishness and blind nationality of the vulgar." But the national advantages which accrued from the skill and industry of the emigrants were too patent to be lightly surrendered, and the selfish advocates for monopoly were mortified by the continuance and increased success of men whom they hated alike as aliens in blood and rivals in trade. (To be continued.)

PROTESTANT POPERY.

Two centuries ago, South observed that "zeal and noise against Popery and real service for it are no such inconsistent things as some may imagine." Not a few of the zealots, both in and out of the Church, who most noisily denounce Popery, illustrate in their own spirit and practice its essential dogmatism and intolerance.

REVISED TRANSLATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.*

Whenever men have found the priestly authority and the unwritten traditions of the Church of Rome a spiritual burden too heavy to be any longer borne, they have sought at once the instrument and the rule of their freedom in the Scriptures. So Wiclif resolved that the light of divine truth should no longer be concealed from the many under the impenetrable veil of a dead language. His own experience led him to the conclusion, which the subsequent history of his nation fully confirmed, that its moral power over the minds and hearts of men would become manifest in proportion as its words of wisdom and admonition became intelligible to them.

Especially did the reformers of the sixteenth century devote themselves to the work of giving the sacred writings to the people in their integrity, and in a language through which their spirit could reach the deepest recesses of men's hearts, and inspire them with purer feelings, loftier aspirations and holier purposes. In the extravagant pretensions of the priest, and the no less extravagant traditions on which he based his assumed authority, the conscientious and thoughtful Christian could find no rest for his troubled spirit,—no satisfaction for the doubts which even the very instincts of his moral nature were continually calling up,—no confidence that there was in religion any divine voice calling him to duty, demanding self-sacrifice or self-devotion, or promising any future existence that should be holier, happier or better, than the present. And under these painful and depressing circumstances it was with perfect consistency that he had recourse to the Scriptures. He believed that his religion, in its highest truths and sanctions, came to him by revelation properly so called, and that the records of that revelation were contained in the sacred writings. Here, then, was a reliable basis for his faith,—an inexhaustible fountain of spiritual wisdom and power, holiness and hope,—and he set himself with all diligence at once to understand it himself, and to make it intelligible to others.

In this the modern reformer only followed the example of the most consistent friends of truth and righteousness in all past time. The very earliest records of revelation bear unmistakeable marks of the correcting hand of the thoughtful transcriber from age to age,—marks from which the conclusion is most unjustly drawn, that the writings are no older than the latest corrections or explanatory additions which they contain. There can be no reasonable doubt that Samuel presented the Mosaic writings to his nation in the most complete and intelligible form that his

* The Holy Scriptures of the Old Covenant, in a Revised Translation. By the late Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, the Rev. George Vance Smith, B.A., and the Rev. John Scott Porter. In Three Vols. London—Longman and Co. 1862.

circumstances permitted, though it is extremely improbable that, as Dr. Colenso would have us believe, he and his disciples invented the greater part of the books which are now called Mosaic, using some popular traditions merely as the occasion or the foundation of their religious romance. There is no reason to believe that, till a comparatively modern time, there existed any such superstitious veneration for the Scriptures as would have prevented Samuel, or any of the prophets, from removing from the sacred books the growing obscurity which the lapse of time inflicts on all writings whatever, and giving them to the people from time to time in such a revised and corrected form as would make them completely intelligible. The change of names which had become obsolete for those which were in common use, sometimes with, sometimes without notice,—the interposed hint respecting the political circumstances of ancient times,—and the completion of the history by the addition of such passages as that containing the death of Moses, without any hint that another has been supplementing the sacred narrative,—these circumstances, and such as these, leave no reasonable doubt that revising the Scriptures for popular use was of old an habitual work of Jewish piety, even more than it is now of Christian zeal. Hence the uniformity of language which characterizes the whole series of the Jewish Scriptures, with but little exception, and which has so often furnished an argument against the comparative antiquity of the earlier books. The reformers then followed an example equally venerable for its antiquity, its piety and its utility, when they sought to restore the Scriptures to their pristine purity; and in translation after translation to make them easily accessible to every class of their followers.

It has long been a subject of deepest regret, equally to the Christian worshiper and the Christian scholar, that the convenience of established churches interrupted the progress of this good work. In the estimation of their dignitaries, as well as of their more ignorant members, it soon became a symptom of the worst heresy to affirm that the Authorized Version of the Scriptures admitted of any improvement, or to attempt to rectify its errors, or to give grace, accuracy and perspicuity to its language. Nor has any church given less encouragement to the scriptural critic than the Church of England. The very name of an Improved Version was sufficient to place its authors or supporters beyond the Christian pale, and to justify the refusal to them of all the courtesies and charities of speech or action. The surest way to preferment lay over the prostrate characters of these heretics; and the crusader who fell before the walls of Jerusalem was hardly deemed more sacred than he who had been raised to the high places of the Church in reward of the anathemas which he had poured forth on an "Improved Version." A faint echo of these anathemas has lately been heard in an "Amicable Correspon-

dence," but happily the day is gone by when it could awaken any general sympathy. Even that manifest and acknowledged corruption of the sacred records, 1 John v. 7, for the genuineness of which no voice of critical authority has long been raised, is maintained as a part of the "word of God," and sent forth as such in their various languages to all the nations.

But the light of truth has shone forth from beneath the bushel under which ecclesiastical authority has sought to conceal it. The attempt is made, happily with only apparent success, to erect such a barrier of pains and penalties around the Bible as should make it the only book which should not feel the improving and renovating power of sound learning and just criticism. And now the barrier is broken down, and the pent-up stream threatens to carry all before it,—the truth with the error,—the faithful record of revelation with the accretions of traditionary error which have attached themselves to it. Free and generous criticism has been denounced,—learning, however sound or impartial, has been forbidden to correct a Bible for the many, as it has the classics for the few. And now two or three volumes of criticism, more free than generous or impartial, have struck terror into the hearts even of the stoutest of the defenders of a verbal inspiration. These now tremble not for the form of the letter alone of the sacred books, but for the body and substance of the Scriptures on which they have rested their everlasting hopes. Relying, as it would appear, on the efficacy of civil law, or on the awe inspired by the doctrine of a verbal divine inspiration, to ward off the rude hand of criticism and maintain the Authorized Version in its integrity, they have not been careful to form a just estimate of the sacred treasure which they so highly valued, or to prepare themselves for a legitimate defence of it. The Lardners, the Priestleys and the Channings of a former generation invited the Churchmen of their time to commence this useful work, and set them an example of faithful zeal and diligence in the prosecution of it. But far from being accepted as allies and fellow-labourers in a good and holy work, they encountered only persecution and reproach. Yet they changed neither their views nor their purposes. And those who took their places when they were called away from the scene of their earthly labours, believing like them that they possess a sacred treasure of divine truth in the Bible, have shewn no little zeal and diligence in restoring it to its integrity, and securing for it thus its legitimate influence in forming the opinions and the lives of men.

The last public testimony to their sincere and rational attachment to the Scriptures is presented in the Revised Translation of the Old Testament, which has suggested these remarks. A considerable portion of this Translation was published, almost in its present form, several years ago, and the remainder is now

added from the pen of scriptural scholars fully competent to the work which they have undertaken. Upon the whole, this is by far the most accurate English version of the Hebrew Scriptures which has ever appeared. In the Preface we are assured, with perfect truth and sincerity, that "the authors of this revision have not undertaken either the establishment of a new text or the production of a new translation of the Scriptures. They have assumed the Common Version as a basis, and have departed from it only where, in their judgment, the text was clearly corrupt, the rendering inaccurate, or the phraseology obsolete or obscure." Accordingly, the dignity and beauty of the Authorized Version are fully preserved in it, while its many defects in point both of accuracy and style are removed. Indeed, the most enthusiastic admirer of this venerable and excellent Version would hardly know that he was using any other, were it not for the additional clearness that is given to words which he would hardly recognize as different. Most wise and judicious has been the determination on the part of the translators not to "let their good be evil spoken of,"—not to offend even innocent prejudice unnecessarily,—not to afford any occasion even to the most timid to say that they are here robbed of the Bible which their parents taught them to reverence and love.

It would not be possible, within the necessary limits of this article, to give anything approaching to a complete account of the improvements of the Authorized Version which are to be found in this Revised Translation, or to do more than briefly indicate their general character. They are to be found in every page of it. In very many cases they are too little conspicuous to attract the attention of the cursory reader, but taken together they add very much to the perspicuity and grace of style, as well as to the substantial accuracy of the whole.

It is unavoidable that in course of time some words should become obsolete, while others so change their meaning as to be unintelligible to the unlearned, and others still cease to be adapted to the tastes of a more refined age. Examples of all these are found in the Common Translation of the Old Testament, and called for the correction which they have here received. Job, for example, speaks of a *daysman* in the sense of an umpire; but this word is now obsolete in the sense in which Job used it, if not in every sense. We are told, Exod. xiii. 18, that the children of Israel went up *harnessed* out of Egypt. And whether the word *harnessed* means *armed* or *in array*, it is obsolete and to the many unintelligible. "David left his carriage in the hand of the keeper of the carriage" (1 Sam. xvii. 22). Here the word *carriage* applies to something which David carried, clothing or otherwise, and which he could conveniently lay aside, and is nearly synonymous with the modern word *baggage;* but in this sense it is now quite obsolete, and to the many unintel-

ligible. The same may be said of the word *prevent*, as when the psalmist says (lxxxiii. 13), "In the morning shall my prayer *prevent* thee," i. e. come up before thee. So also *silverlings*, Isa. vii. 23, is no longer used to signify pieces of silver; nor does *hiss*, Isa. vii. 18, any longer signify to call for; and the phrase, *a smoke in my nose*, Isa. lxv. 5, is well exchanged for the more intelligible as well as classical expression, *offensive to me*. In the sixty-third chapter of this prophet, as well as in the books of Samuel and Kings, the necessity for such changes is sometimes still more urgent.

But even when the words of the Authorized Version are in themselves both modern and quite intelligible, the idea which they are meant to convey is obscure or inscrutable. Of this character, to the uninformed reader, is the expression, Hos. xiv. 2, "the calves of our lips;" and the promise, Isa. lii. 14, that "the servant of the Lord shall *sprinkle* many nations." In the second clause of Isaiah ix. 3, the prophet's meaning is absolutely reversed; while in the 5th verse of the same chapter, his words are made to express hardly any consistent sense at all, though when rightly translated they have great beauty from their allusion to a significant ancient custom, and form an appropriate introduction to the striking passage which follows them. Bishop Lowth very truly observes, in the Introduction to his Translation of Isaiah, that "the improvements of which the Common Version is capable are great and numberless." And it is not too much to say, that the Revised Translation contains such improvements, as far as the present state of biblical learning renders them possible.

One remarkable characteristic of this Translation is found in its freedom from all appearance of sectarian bias. It affords no ground for the charge of partiality or prejudice in its renderings of passages of disputed theological signification. Even when a translation most favourable to the theological opinions of the authors would have been quite consistent with the usages of language and the intentions of the sacred writer, they have avoided it, except where fidelity to the original required its adoption. *Elohim* must of necessity be often translated by some such word as *judges* or *magistrates*, as in Exod. xxi. 6, xxii. 28, or *the strong* or *the mighty*, as in Ezek. xxxii. 21; yet in Ps. xlv. 6, we find in this Revised Translation, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," though the whole tenor of the Psalm would lead us to regard it as addressed to a human ruler.

It is true, indeed, that in Exod. iii. 14, in obedience to the demands of strict textual accuracy, these translators have changed "I am that I am," into "I will be what I will be," and so rendered this text unfit for the dogmatic use or abuse of it which was founded on the mere sound of the words. But here, unless

they had consented to depart widely from the Hebrew text which they were translating, they had no alternative.

We find in Isa. ix. 6, a good instance of the strict literal rendering to which the authors of the Revised Translation adhere with great regularity. Bishop Lowth had ventured to substitute "Father of the everlasting age" for the "everlasting Father" of the Common Version; but they, with scrupulous adherence to the letter of the original, render the latter part of the verse thus: "his name shall be called Wonder, Counsellor, mighty God, everlasting Father, Prince of Peace." Most readers, even though looking at the text with a critical eye, would prefer *wonderful* to *wonder*, as equally accurate and more agreeable to the ear; and some would prefer *mighty prince*, or *ruler*, to *mighty God*, in accordance with the rendering of the similar expression in Ezekiel already referred to. But the Revised Translation, all things considered, appears to be the best, in regard both of strict accuracy and doctrinal tendency. For the omission of the article in the last three clauses, agreeably to the original, gives to these the appearance and significancy of simple adjectives, which express the dignity and beneficence of their subject without assuming so much of the form of definite dogma. As judges and magistrates were called Elohim, according to the idiom of the Hebrew language, when Isaiah foretold that the name of some distinguished person would be called *mighty God* (el ghibbor), he need not,—nay, he cannot,—reasonably be supposed to mean anything more than that he should be a ruler of great power and authority. And when his name is declared to be not *the* everlasting Father, but *everlasting Father*, we should not be justified by the idiom of the language in ascribing to the phrase any other meaning than that he should be distinguished for pure and impartial benevolence.

There are some portions of the Scriptures, however, which, in the course of revision, might have been improved by a larger degree of alteration than they have experienced. The imprecatory Psalms might be clothed in an English dress, more becoming to him who wrote them, as well as more agreeable and instructive to those who read them. They are usually regarded as quite unfit for use in Christian worship, as they seem to breathe forth curses rather than blessings on those at whose hands the psalmist had sustained injury. However bitter or violent these imprecations may be, they differ in some most important particulars from the anathemas which Christian priests and churches have pronounced on real or fancied enemies. In the Jewish theology there was no devil to whom the enemies of Jehovah were or could be consigned for vengeance. The language of the Jewish prophet, speaking in the name of Jehovah, was—"I am Jehovah, and there is none else; I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I, Jehovah, do all these things." Isa. xlv. 7.

And hence the punishment of the wicked, as well as the rewards of the righteous, was only the discipline of a righteous and beneficent Providence. And as the good man mourned over the afflictions entailed on society by the crimes and passions of the wicked, he might, without infringing any principle of piety that was essential to his religion, call upon Jehovah to vindicate his authority on the earth speedily, and give an early victory to truth and righteousness. In most of the cases, too, in which this apparently uncharitable spirit in the Psalms offends the moral sensibility of the Christian, the verbs are in the future tense, and, if literally rendered, would express only a prediction that an evil day awaited the transgressors of the Divine law. Nor would true piety wish the Divine decree respecting the future of the wicked altered. When, then, the psalmist has written in the future tense respecting the retribution which should overtake his enemies, would it not be an act of simple justice to give his words the same form in English? It may be that we should thus cease to do a grievous wrong to a man who was distinguished far more for habitual piety than for infirmity either of temper or conduct, while we should certainly be removing a stumbling-block out of the way of many a reader, who feels it good and profitable to cultivate an intimacy with the lofty devotion of the book of Psalms.

The task which the authors of the Revised Translation undertook, and which they have executed with so much faithfulness and success, may seem to many a very humble one, as compared with the terrific glare which the Essayists and Reviewers and the Bishop of Natal have thrown over the little ecclesiastical world of England. But it is surely a more wise and rational course to place the Scriptures themselves in their integrity before the English public, than, leaving them uncorrected, to occupy and perplex the minds of the multitude with one-sided views of some of the most difficult questions of biblical criticism. The meagre and partial contributions to biblical criticism to which allusion has been made, may do good by the agitation which they have produced, especially if that agitation produce the conviction in high places that theology ought to be largely and systematically taught in our universities, untrammelled by creeds and articles. But they can do no other good whatever. Not so the Revised Translation of the Scriptures. That is adapted to accomplish an object at once reasonable and practical now, and to prepare the way for a successful pursuit of the higher branches of scriptural criticism in all future time.

NOTES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

PSALM xlv. *On Solomon's Marriage with the Egyptian Princess.*

1 My heart is overflowing with a good matter;
I speak of the things which I have made touching the king;
My tongue is the pen of a ready writer.

To the King.

2 Thou fairest of the sons of Adam,
Grace is poured into thy lips;
Therefore God hath blessed thee for ever.
3 Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O Mighty One,
With thy glory and thy majesty,
4 And in thy majesty ride prosperously,
In the cause of truth and meekness and righteousness;
And thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things.

To God.

5 Thine arrows are sharp (the people fall before thee)
In the heart of the king's enemies.
6 Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;
A sceptre of justice is the sceptre of thy kingdom.

To the King.

7 Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness;
Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee
With the oil of gladness above thy fellows.
8 All thy garments smell of myrrh and aloes and cassia:
Out of ivory palaces musical instruments delight thee.
9 King's daughters are among thy beloved women;
Upon thy right hand doth stand the queen in gold of Ophir.

To the Queen.

10 Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear;
Forget also thine own people and thy father's house.
11 So shall the king greatly desire thy beauty;
For he is thy lord; and worship thou him.
12 And the daughter of Tyre shall be there with a gift;
Even the rich among the people shall entreat thy favour.

To the King.

13 All glorious is the king's daughter in her house.
Her clothing is woven with gold.
14 In embroidery she shall be led unto the king.
The maidens, her companions that follow her, shall be brought to thee;
15 With gladness and rejoicing shall they be led;
They shall enter into the king's palace.

To the Queen.

16 Instead of thy fathers shall be thy children,
Whom thou shalt make princes in all the land.
17 I will make thy name to be remembered in all generations;
Therefore shall the people praise thee for ever and ever.

This Psalm can hardly be well understood without dividing it in the above manner, according to the persons to whom the

several portions are addressed. The last portion seems to belong to the Queen, because she was leaving her home and her forefathers, while the King was remaining with his. But what is chiefly important is to separate correctly the verses which are addressed to the Almighty from those which are addressed to the King, and more particularly because some of these verses are quoted at the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The writer of that Epistle seems to have misunderstood them; and we must be careful not to be misled by him.

In the Hebrew language, the word El is *God*, or rather *a god*. In Psalm l. 1, and in other places, Jehovah is called El Elohim, or *God of gods*, to distinguish him from the gods of the Gentiles. But more commonly in the Bible he is styled shortly Elohim, which may be considered as an abbreviation of El Elohim, *God of gods*. In the same way the inner sanctuary of the temple was called the Holy of Holies, and sometimes the Holies, as an abbreviation of the former. These remarks are made to explain that the word Elohim, *God*, in ver. 6, cannot be applied to the King or any one but the Almighty, although the word El, *God*, is sometimes applicable to inferior beings.

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in quoting from this Psalm, treats it as applicable, though perhaps only in a secondary sense, to the expected Messiah. He treats verses 6 and 7 as part of the same speech; and in this he has been usually followed by other translators, who consider "thou Mighty One" of verse 3 of this Psalm as meaning the King, and understand Elohim, *O God*, of verse 6 also to mean the King.

Gesenius, however, in his Lexicon, wisely seeing that the word Elohim can mean no one but the Almighty, and supposing that verse 6 is addressed to Solomon, translates it rather violently as, "God is thy throne." In this he has also been followed by some translators of the New Testament, when the words are quoted in the Epistle to the Hebrews. But if the above division of the poem into its several speeches be allowed, it removes all difficulty; though, on the other hand, it seems to shew that it had been misunderstood by the writer of the Epistle.

As the writer of the Epistle understood verses 6 and 7 as both addressed to the same person, he probably understood the word "God" in verse 7 to be in the vocative case, and to mean "O God," as in verse 6; whereas the Psalm used the latter in the nominative case, and the former only the vocative.

The whole seems to be a poem to be sung in alternate parts by two sets of singers, written with strophe and antistrophe. We have divided it into seven parts. In the title it is described as a Psalm upon Shoshannim, which may mean "of six parts," and our seventh part may have been a chorus sung by the two sets of singers united.

S. S.

PERRY'S HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.*

Mr. Perry treats the Synod of Dort in 1618 fairly enough, but rather feebly. The share which the Church of England took in that discreditable ecclesiastical assembly makes this portion of its history far from agreeable to those who, while adhering closely to the Church of England, yet repudiate Calvinism. The King, with ridiculous pedantry, had engaged in controversy with the Arminian Vorstius, who proved more than a match for his royal antagonist. With wounds yet smarting, the King was eager in an anti-Arminian policy, and sent four known Calvinists to represent the Church of England at the Synod. The five points of the Arminians were condemned by the Synod. Our historian frankly enough states the case:

"Such were the famous five points of Arminius, of which it is not too much to say that they enunciate doctrines held by the great majority of the Church of England at the present day. Yet in the seventeenth century, they were held to be deadly heresy. Sub-lapsarians and supra-lapsarians combined against them. It was nothing to these men that none of the early fathers, before the time of Augustine, had ventured to set limits to the Divine grace and mercy. Calvin had said it, and Calvin was more than all the fathers."

So long as the Church of England owns an earthly head in its monarch, it should devoutly pray that that important functionary may have no special theological tastes. A zeal for controversy, as in the case of Henry VIII. and James I., leads to contrasts and contradictions, which are awkward facts in the history of a Church which always claims to be apostolical and to be regulated by unvarying articles and creeds. It was a happy circumstance that our ambassador at the Hague sent his chaplain to Dort as a reporter. We have in the letters of the "ever-memorable" John Hales, the best account of the Synod's doings. He owed something to the Synod, and in respect to him so does the Church of which he became a distinguished ornament. He went to Dort a Calvinist, but when he listened to Episcopius pressing the words of John iii. 16, "For God so loved the world," &c., his good sense and candour prevailed over his early faith, and here, to quote his own words, "he bade John Calvin goodnight."

And it was not long before the King also was willing to bid good-night to Calvin.

Mr. Perry does not care to conceal or to soften the misdeeds of James's bishops. He tells us how Llandaff (Field) "stood convicted of acting as jackall to Lord Bacon and of procuring bribes for the Chancellor, with a heavy commission to himself for transacting the business;" how Lincoln (Williams) took

---

* Continued from p. 48.

credit to himself for having often lied to the Marquis of Hamilton to promote the interests of the favourite, Buckingham; how enormous the digestion of the same prelate was—for when he had swallowed a bishopric, a deanery, a prebend's stall and a good living, he whined for more, coveting every tit-bit of patronage fit for an episcopal palate; and how, to crown all, he pleaded, in a letter to Buckingham (which our historian calls "one of the coolest begging letters on record"), as a reason why something should be done for him, that his "bribes" were "very little." It was to this man, acting by the instigation of Buckingham, that the Church of England owed the promotion to the episcopal bench of the prelate whose mischievous activity and deadly influence with Charles cost both himself and his monarch their heads, and the Church for some years its very existence. James, it is said, at first resisted the appointment of Laud, and on grounds which, if truly stated, were well justified by the result. "I keep Laud back from all places of rule and authority, because I find he hath a restless spirit, and cannot see when matters are well."

Mr. Perry's sketch of the career of Antony de Dominis is one of many illustrations of the truth lurking under the epigrammatic remark of a living statesman, that "he never heard the word *convert* used without thinking of *convict*."

"Marc Antony de Dominis was Archbishop of Spalatro, in Dalmatia, under the rule of Venice, and appears to have taken a leading part in the quarrel and temporary estrangement between Venice and the Court of Rome. For this reason when, through the mediation of Henry IV. of France, Venice and the Pope were reconciled, his holiness appointed a yearly pension of five hundred crowns to be paid out of the revenues of the See of Spalatro. The archbishop highly resented this, and so deeply moved was he that he applied to Sir D. Carlton, the English ambassador at Venice, to know whether he would be received into the Church of England. He was well acquainted with the doctrines and constitution of the English Church, from his intimacy with Sir Henry Wotton and William Bedell, his learned chaplain, during the disputes of Venice with the See of Rome. He observed, he said, many abuses and corruptions in the Church of Rome, and he desired, before all things, to live in a church reformed, but especially he had an affection for the Church of England. The ambassador acquainted King James, who 'thought that the quarrel of Venice had been the effect of his own book written for the Oath of Allegiance, and, therefore, did the more approve of the bishop and desire to receive him.' It was arranged that he should come to England, and, on his arrival, be entertained at Lambeth; and all the English bishops agreed to contribute towards his maintenance. 'It is incredible,' says Fuller, 'what flocking of people there was to behold this old archbishop now a new convert; prelates and peers presented him with gifts of high valuation.' He was a man 'old and corpulent,' says Wilson, but of a comely presence. He was gifted with an unlimited assurance, plenty of ready talent in writing and speaking, of a 'jeering temper,' and of a most

grasping avarice. 'He was *De Dominis* in the plural,' says Crakanthorp, 'for he could serve two masters, or twenty if they paid him wages.' He soon began to petition for preferment. The King gave him the Deanery of Windsor and the Mastership of the Savoy, and he gave himself the living of West-Ilsley, in Berkshire, having made a shift to read the Thirty-nine Articles in English, for his induction. Quickly he gave proof of his avarice, by trying to overset all the leases granted by his predecessors at the Savoy, that he might levy fresh fines. In this design, however, he was checked by Dr. King, Bishop of London, who severely reproved him for his covetousness. The archbishop now set himself to work to perfect and publish his books, and brought out three large folios—*De Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ*. 'He exclaims,' says Fuller, 'In reading, meditation, and writing, I am almost pined away,' but his fat cheeks did confute his false tongue in that expression.' Being now grown confident, he ventured to indulge his jeering temper at the expense of Count Gondomar, the Spanish Ambassador. The don took deadly offence, and immediately proceeded to contrive the archbishop's ruin. Having great influence at Rome, he was easily able to induce the Pope to send the most flattering offers to the Archbishop of Spalatro if he would return. The greedy old man swallowed the bait. When he heard of the '*premium octuplicis stipendii*,' he was at once smitten with a longing desire to revisit his native land, and petitioned the King to allow his departure. The King was indignant, as he justly might be, at the barefaced hypocrisy of the pretended convert. He was ordered to leave England in twenty days. At this moment, Toby Matthews, the aged Archbishop of York, set forth one of his accustomed hoaxes as to his own death. De Dominis had the inconceivable assurance to ask for the place. He was, of course, refused with scorn. Then he started for Brussels, with his trunks full of English gold. At Brussels he was to receive his red hat of Cardinal, and his appointment to a rich bishopric, according to the Pope's promise. None of these good things, however, came. Having occupied some time in writing a railing book against the Church of England, he was obliged to go on his way to Rome, without any safe conduct or assurance of the Pope's favour. Arrived there, he found himself an object of suspicion to the Inquisition, which soon managed to get him immured in prison, and after his death, caused his body to be burnt as that of a heretic. It was a fitting end for a rank impostor and hypocrite. The character of him, given by Dr. Fitzherbert, Rector of the English College at Rome, to Sir E. Sackville, seems not an unjust one: 'He was a malcontent knave when he fled from us, a railing knave while he lived with you, and a motley parti-coloured knave now he is come again.' "*—I. 303—307.

---

* Dr. Newland, Dean of Ferns, published not long since a life of the Archbishop of Spalatro, a work of little value in any respect, and defective even as a collection of documents, as it gives no account of the mass of State Papers illustrative of the life in England of this rapacious and dishonest Italian. The Dean feebly hints an apology for him, founded on the course pursued by James and his representatives at Dort in condemning the Arminian doctrines. But the purpose of the Synod was notoriously to put the Arminian divines on their trial and secure their condemnation. Spalatro was on the most confidential terms with Bishop Carlton, the leader of the English Calvinistic representatives at Dort, and himself publicly prayed in London for the Synod. In one of his letters,

Of the history of the Pilgrim Fathers, Mr. Perry gives a brief but far from accurate report. Why he should content himself with Neal and Masson as his authorities on a subject on which information drawn from original and recently discovered authorities is accessible, we cannot surmise. The little flock at Leyden were not, as he describes them, apprehensive of being "absorbed into the Dutch Church," but as Englishmen they were jealous of the retention of the English tongue, and they longed to be again under the protection of the state of England. One of the Pilgrims (Winslow) records that they left Holland and went to America that "they might more glorify God, do more good to their country, better provide for their posterity, and live to be more refreshed by their labours, than ever they could do in Holland where they were." Mr. Perry gives as the date of their reaching the shores of the New World, November 9, 1620. It is true the Mayflower sighted on that day the white sand-banks of Cape Cod, but did not drop anchor in the roadstead till November 11. But if any date were given, it should surely be that which is still celebrated in New England with religious enthusiasm, December 11 (O. S., now December 22 *), when the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock.

The close of the reign of James the First found Church and State in England in a disastrous plight. Mr. Perry's description of the ecclesiastical condition of the country is ominous of a coming storm.

"The Church shared in the unpopularity of Government, and it had also other causes of unpopularity of its own. The bishops, for the most part, passed their time in hanging about Court, looking out for preferment, instead of working earnestly among their clergy. The constant translations which made patronage more abundant, prevented the prelate from knowing anything of a diocese which perhaps he only occupied for a year, and made those who were allowed to remain in the poorer dioceses discontented and impatient. Men were advanced to the highest posts in the Church at the word of a favourite, through an excess of servile adulation, or from a controversial thesis cleverly argued. With the exception of Bishops Andrewes and Morton, there were no men of conspicuous merit among the prelates of King James. Some of them were men in every way contemptible. If we are to believe even a very small part of the libels freely vented a few years later, many of the country clergy were not only ignorant, but immoral. These charges were levelled both at the High Church and the Puritanical party. The poverty in which they lived lowered and degraded the county parsons

---

preserved in the State Papers, the Italian shews himself not less apt than the English divines of his day in court flattery. Speaking of King James, he says he "finds, like the Queen of Sheba, the greatness of Solomon more than it was ever reported."

* The rightful day is December 21; but when the celebration of the Plymouth anniversary began, eleven days were by an error added to the O. S. date, instead of ten.

and drove them to the ale-house for amusement and society. Many were, doubtless, bright examples of the noblest virtues. Such was Mr. Copinger, parson of Laleham, mentioned by Fuller. 'He lived forty and five years the painful parson of Laleham, in which market-town were above nine hundred communicants, amongst whom all his time no difference did arise, which he did not compound.' Such was good Joseph Hall, in his poor parsonage of Halsted, and such were a thousand others. But the poor and mean estate of many, and the prevalence of scandals, while Court divines added one good benefice to another, and bishops held rich livings by *commendams*, must have given the Puritan declaimer a vast advantage."—I. 321, 322.

The Churchman whose counsels swayed the policy of the young King was "narrow-minded, impolitic and imprudent, a stickler for ceremonial and externals," and the author of "a policy of repression, coercion and menace." We need not say this is the portrait of Archbishop Laud. In the progress of his work, Mr. Perry seeks to vindicate the memory of Laud from the charge of vindictiveness and cruelty. That popular censure may have overshot its mark with respect to Laud is probable. Mr. Perry refers to letters of the Archbishop only recently published, and which, he alleges, vindicate him from the reproach of cruelty towards the keeper Williams, but he is silent in respect to the more serious proofs. The part that Laud took in the censure at the Star Chamber of Bastwick, Burton and Prynne, is undeniable. The brutal punishment inflicted on those men was formally approved by the Archbishop, who hinted that the libellers might have been proceeded against capitally, as they would have been under "the imperial laws." The Archbishop published his speech, and in his closing words commends the "noble patience" of the court and the "just and honourable censure" on a clergyman, a barrister and a physician (viz. imprisonment for life, a heavy fine, to be branded on the face, to be pilloried, and, above all, to lose their ears). Still worse was Laud's demeanour when the horrible sentence was passed on Dr. Leighton. After listening to the sickening details of whipping, nose-slitting and the cutting off, at two operations, separated by several days, of the ears of the accused, Laud pulled off his cap and solemnly gave God thanks. Now, as Mr. Perry admits that Charles took "all his Church measures from the Archbishop's advice," and that he was "the docile instrument of Laud in all things," it is, we think, a useless attempt, while such facts as we have alluded to are staring us in the face, to argue that Laud was not cruel and vindictive.

There is an interesting chapter in Mr. Perry's first volume, in which he gives a series of personal sketches (pp. 400—425) of clergymen in the reign of Charles the First who honoured the Church and our common Christianity by their piety and other virtues. But vain were their labours while most of the clergy

gave a passionate following to the intemperate and cruel counsels of the Primate. A broad gulf stretched between the clerical and the lay mind of England in this matter.

"With the laity he had made no progress. In them there was not the same ready and complete apparatus of suspension, deprivation, and imprisonment. The High Commission Court and the Bishops' Consistories were sufficient to vex and exasperate, without breaking or intimidating their spirit. The grand and fundamental mistake which Laud had made, was the ignoring and slighting the great body of intelligent, wealthy, spirited, and energetic lay gentlemen of England. It is, perhaps, impossible for us rightly to estimate the bitter detestation in which the low-born, mean-looking, rough, uncourteous, passionate little man, who was misgoverning England, and leading the King they still loved into ruinous courses, was held by the dwellers in the old halls and manor-houses of the country."—I. 584, 585.

Such were the feelings of the laity. When they saw that the prelate whom they viewed with mingled contempt and hatred had (in Mr. Perry's words) "managed to establish an almost complete ascendancy over the whole clergy of the Church," need we wonder that the Church and the Monarchy presently shared a common though temporary ruin? In a much milder form, what happened in the seventeenth century seems about to be repeated in our own day. With intemperate zeal against the heresy and free thinking of some of their brethren, the mass of the clergy of England are crying out for prosecutions, which, spite of the caveat of Dr. Pusey, most of the intelligent laity of the country regard as "persecution."* The censure which Lord Clarendon affixed to the clergy of his day, of want of practical wisdom and reading the signs of the times, seems still applicable to that class of men.

In entering on that part of his work which records the history

* The reference is to Dr. Pusey's letter in the *Times* of February 19, on the prosecution of Professor Jowett. It would be well if members of Convocation and Heads of Houses at the universities would weigh such words as those in the *Times* newspaper of which Dr. Pusey complains. When a journal conducted on the principle of the *Times* speaks of "vindictive prosecutions," "common antipathy to religious freedom," "unworthy jealousy of independency," "a rooted distrust of the power of truth to abide the ordeal of free inquiry," "odium theologicum," and "the attempt to set up the interests of religion and piety against those of truth and justice," Churchmen should pause. The writers in the leading journal care little for truth and religious liberty, but they are keen observers of the tides of public opinion, and words like these are not encouraging to clerical persecutors.

Dr. Pusey's letter is in other respects remarkable. A man who has himself been the mark of *evangelical* vituperation, should consider whether it is prudent to give to mere odium theologicum the voice wherewith to curse and the arm wherewith to strike. Dr. Pusey says "that we should teach what we have professed to believe," and that it is most demoralizing (a sentiment with which we entirely coincide) that "clergyman should profess their belief in great fundamental truths and assert the contrary." How easily may the Professor's words be illustrated in a censure of himself eating the bread of a Protestant Church and giving the weight of his learning and influence to a theology on some important points nearer to Romish than to Anglican principles!

of the downfal of the Church, Mr. Perry draws attention to what he styles "a very important fact," suggested by Archbishop Laud's Annual Report of the Province of Canterbury, 1640; and particularly that in which he deploringly alludes to the prevalence in his diocese of obscure sectaries who could not be got rid of.

"Unconformable clergy could be reduced, even laymen of mark and position could be frightened by the terrors of the High Commission Court into a sullen outward compliance, but the obscure sectaries were beyond clerical control. Too numerous for imprisonment, too poor for fines, too stubborn for monitions, they began now greatly to abound and multiply, especially in the metropolis. Instructed and excited by teachers the most fanatical and ignorant, in the wildest schemes of theology, drawn from the metaphorical poetry of the Old Testament, 'notwithstanding the active inquisition of Laud,' says M. Guizot, 'sects of all descriptions assembled in towns, in some cellar, in the country, under the roof of a barn, or in the midst of a wood. The dismal character of the locality, their perils and difficulties in meeting, all excited the imagination of preachers and hearers; they passed together long hours, often whole nights, praying, singing hymns, seeking the Lord, and cursing their enemies.' These were the men who, in a few years, were to make the Ironsides of Cromwell, to reign for a time triumphant; and then, by the wildness of their eccentricities, to restore the government in Church and State, which they so much hated. They were the *débris* of the congregations of the Puritan ministers, who had either conformed, been silenced, or fled; and having lost the pastors to whom they had formerly loved to listen, they were now at the mercy of any tailor or shoemaker who would assert a call, and invoke Heaven's judgments against the persecuting bishops. These sectaries were now despised, but they were soon to be feared."—I. 591, 592.

A more severe censure than a statement like this could scarcely fall on the Church of England, which had possessed the exclusive right of educating the people in their religious faith and accustoming them to decorous habits of worship. Under the circumstances described, wisdom would have suggested a more zealous administration of the Word of God to the common people, and their systematic training under properly educated pastors in theological knowledge. This is the course which during the last thirty years the Church has followed, and the result, an increase in her power and influence surpassing that made in the same period by any of the Dissenting sects. But this was not the policy of Laud. His efforts were too exclusively applied to produce uniformity in the ritual and ecclesiastical buildings, in the position and furniture of the altar-table, in the robes of the clergy and other trifling matters, but more especially in crushing out every spark of independence in the clergy. How indifferent he was to the more important matter of a well-instructed people is illustrated by the condition of the people of Maidstone. The living of Maidstone was held by the Archbishop himself; there

was a population of 6000 inhabitants; the tithes brought more than £400 per annum; the parish church was the single place of worship. It was put under the care of Robert Barrell, a curate, who preached only once in four or five weeks, and then struck more at what he called schism and faction than sin. In his absence, the duty was performed by incompetent men who created derision rather than respect. The request to preach in the afternoon he refused, ridiculing afternoon sermons, saying they were but prating and babbling. The parishioners of Maidstone who sought spiritual edification elsewhere in the afternoon, were dragged into the ecclesiastical courts, to the saddening of their hearts and the wasting of their substance. While lax in the performance of his duties, he exacted tithes with grasping severity, having obtained a lease of the vicarage tithes from the Archbishop. In addition to his other faults, his private life was not free from censure. Such, according to the statement of the people of Maidstone, in a petition presented May 17, 1641, by Sir Edward Dering, was the spiritual pastor and teacher provided for them by the Primate himself. We may suppose, fairly enough, that it would not be worse off than most other parishes. If we may trust the evidence, direct and indirect, which the Camden Society's volume respecting the Proceedings in Kent before the Committee of Religion gives, Mr. Perry has understated, in the last passage we quoted, both the intelligence of the people and the number of the Puritan clergy, who were willing at every risk to continue the teaching which the Church did not give them, though they longed for it as travellers for water in the desert.

We must reserve for one other article some remarks on Mr. Perry's second volume.

His sketches of eminent ecclesiastics are never brilliant, but are for the most part judicious and faithful. We select as a specimen that of Dr. Thomas Jackson, President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

"As a theologian, Dr. Jackson occupies a middle place between the patristic school of Laud, Cosin, and Montagu, and the latitudinarian school of Chillingworth and Hales. The former argued against the Romanists from the Fathers and the practice of the Primitive Church, the latter overthrew his dogmata from Scripture and Reason. But Chillingworth had no positive theology, and did not assert the existence of a guide which could direct all religious opinions without fail into perfect truth. His view was that an honest interpretation of Scripture was a sufficient, not a complete director. 'I will think,' he says, 'no man the worse man, nor the worse Christian, for differing in opinion from me. I am fully persuaded that God does not, and, therefore, that man ought not, to require any more of any man than this—to believe the Scripture to be God's Word, to endeavour to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it.' This rule of charity was arrived at by this masterly thinker, because he did not see that there was any uni-

versal infallible authority to be reached; Scripture being liable to so great a variety of interpretations. But Dr. Jackson held otherwise. He believed that in Scripture interpreted under certain moral conditions, with faith and prayer, there was, by the action of God's spirit on the mind of the Christian student, a complete and infallible guide on all religious matters. '*He* cannot,' says he, 'fail in anything; and whatsoever he saith, or what his spirit shall witness to my spirit to have proceeded from him, I am bound to believe. And in the confidence of God's promises for the increase of faith and grace for all such as use them aright, every Christian, in sobriety of spirit, may, by the principles of faith, planted by God's finger in his heart, examine the sentences and decrees of the wisest men on earth, approve them if he can discern them to be true, confute them if false.' He thus makes the test of truth subjective, and refers it, in great measure, to the αἴσθησις of the good man in reading the Scriptures—a doctrine which has ever been the most prevalent and the most popular in our Church, though divines have usually had a tendency towards the school of Laud, and men of the world have favoured the bolder views of Chillingworth. Dr. Jackson is greatly inferior in lucidity of style and argument to Chillingworth; and in vigour, earnestness, and spirit, to Bishop Hall."—I. 627—629.

COLENSO ON THE PENTATEUCH. (Part II.)*

The reception given to Dr. Colenso's book by the ecclesiastics and zealots of his own Church on the one hand and by the general public on the other, is full of significance in each direction.

Addressed, as it is especially, to the intelligent and thoughtful (though not learned) laity, it has been widely and eagerly read by them as putting into words many of their own silent doubts, difficulties and disbeliefs, which their clerical guides have hitherto been accustomed to suppress or smooth over, instead of stating them plainly and discussing them fairly. Whether Dr. Colenso's conclusions are satisfactory, or legitimate, or necessary, is another question, on which we shall endeavour in our turn to speak freely and fairly. But on the part of the defenders of the established or conventional orthodoxy, neither freedom nor fairness has been yet shewn. His learned brethren of the episcopal order, after having (as it is well understood) seen reason to despair of applying ecclesiastical law to a Bishop's alleged heresy, send forth in their "deep brotherly anxiety" a maudlin request to know whether he can "without harm to his own conscience retain his position," and suggest the alternative of his seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit to restore his former state of conventional belief.

---

* The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically considered. By the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. Part II. Longman. 1863.

They do not tell him *how* a Bishop can unfrock himself. It is sad to see the names of all the consecrated English Bishops except three (with many Irish and colonial ones) appended to this appeal;—most sad of all to find that of Hampden sent afterwards, with an expression of regret to have been left out, and of further regret that "the address is not as condemnatory as he could have wished it to have been." St. David's and Peterborough have, we trust, deliberately withheld their pens. Whately's is seen there with surprise.

The orthodox religious press has not yet faced the question, though many little attempts have been made to fence with it. The most extravagant re-assertions of the verbal, literal, total and absolute inspiration of every part of the Bible have indeed been elicited (such as are penned most easily by men who never read the Bible half through), as if to justify Colenso to those thoughtful persons who had imagined he was fighting against the mere spectres of an obsolete ignorance. Some of these religious publications trifle with the subject in feeble imitation of the "Historic doubts," pretending to prove that Bishop Colenso *cannot* have written the book, or that if he did it *must have been as an experiment upon the credulity of sceptics!* But as for meeting his argument fairly or intelligently, we regret to say we do not know that this has been attempted yet in the orthodox world. Holy horror and alarm, sincere (we presume), but exaggerative and unfair towards the object of their aversion and dread, take the place of biblical criticism in the common orthodox world from the bench of Bishops downwards.—We are more surprised, however, and in that proportion more grieved, at the tone in which the secular press has in several instances alluded to Colenso and the biblical controversy of which he is the centre. We thought we might claim from the secular press a manly admiration at least for the evident honesty and straightforwardness of this man. We thought we might anticipate from our men of literature and politics, if they do take notice of theological discussions at all, that they should endeavour to trace the connection of admitted free thought on any one subject with its exercise on all subjects. We might have looked to them for the response of the earnest-minded laity on whose behalf Bishop Colenso incurs ecclesiastical odium, and to whom he and all other Church reformers look as furnishing the only vital force available for a true and healthy Church reform. It is disappointing, therefore, and even disgusting, to see his book and his position treated with levity and joke and sneer by writers in the daily and weekly newspapers, who in taunting him with his defection from orthodoxy as a foolish and unworldly-wise step, scrupulously avoid expressing a theological belief of their own, and (if we may judge from indirect signs) have no more orthodoxy than he on whom they spend their jeers. But perhaps the most unworthy, while the most elabo-

rate, attack of all is one which bears the honoured name of Arnold, and which, under the pretentious claim of "literary criticism," endeavours to deny to Colenso's book standing-room in literature, thus excusing the critic from the obligation to refute or even to review it. This special pleader says in effect: Every book must be written either for the wise few or for the ignorant many. It must be fitted either to impart new knowledge to the former, or to edify the latter. Now Colenso's book does neither. It tells the wise few nothing new to them; it cannot be regarded as an edifying book for the ignorant many, who need not know what *we* know. And so the book is put out of the court of literary criticism! It cannot be thus suppressed, however, in the hands of those who are neither of the select few nor of the incapable many. It will not, at the mandate of "literary criticism," cease to find readers among those who are partly wise and partly ignorant, and who even regard an increase of religious knowledge as favourable to religious edification. This large class of readers, thinkers and persons capable of edification, can be no more extinguished by such literary criticism than the book itself. Anything more evasive and disingenuous in itself, or more really damaging alike to theological inquiry and religious edification, than this pedantic attempt to separate books and their readers into the two classes which once were separate and distinguishable, but are now intermixed and varied with every varying proportion of knowledge and edification, we cannot imagine.*

If it should soon become evident (as we are disposed to think it may) that the great questions which now distract the Church of England must be really met, in the honest purpose of making that Church truly national, we shall find the secular newspaper adopting the serious and resolute tone of the nation, and even the *Times* will become to all appearance as earnest in the work as the penny *Daily Telegraph* already shews itself, with an unaffected seriousness that is to be named with highest respect.

But how is it that we find all this evasion and beating about the bush? What is the difficulty that prevents free-born Englishmen, who can discuss their differences of opinion on literature, science, art and even politics, with mutual respect and good-humour, from treating in a similar but proportionately more respectful spirit their mutual differences of opinion on religion? The difficulties are expressed in two words, *established orthodoxy*. If there were in literature, in science, in art or politics, an *established orthodoxy*, there would be in any such department the same stagnation of knowledge, the same apathy to inquiry, the same resistance to new or unusual ideas, the

* Macmillan's Magazine for February. In the following number the writer endeavours to mitigate his mistake without confessing it, by adopting Dr. Stanley's Three Discourses on the Bible as a sample of a book that combines knowledge and edification.

same suppression of inconvenient doubts, the same half-conscious evasion of difficulties, the same dull conformity of confession; and the same lax belief, the same silent unbelief, the same occasional brave expression of real thought, doubt or different belief, pooh-poohed in the same worldly-wise way, and frowned upon with the same orthodox horror. We have had many such orthodoxies, and in some few instances they have been established orthodoxies. Every such orthodoxy has been bigoted and timid, resting on prescription and resisting progress; the few that have been established—that is, connected with worldly power and wealth (such as nomination boroughs, close corporations, corn-laws and restrictive import duties)—have been also oppressive as monopolies or cruel in their power to persecute.

The Church of England is a theological monopoly which the spirit of our nation has as thoroughly outgrown as it had the system of nomination boroughs, close municipal corporations, or restrictive corn-laws, when those several monopolies were abolished. It now as clearly requires reform in its doctrinal constitution (not now to travel into other matters), as our constitution in Church and State once needed the Toleration Act, and has since submitted with advantage to the repeal of the Test Acts and of Unitarian and Catholic disabilities.

The Church of England has, ever since the Reformation, held an anomalous position, dissenting altogether from Rome, yet not cordially admitting any of the three great principles of Protestantism: personal faith, the sufficiency of the Scriptures, or the right of individual opinion. She makes declarations indeed of the sufficiency of the Scriptures, but these are nullified by her imposition of unscriptural creeds and articles. And she seems to assert here and there the Protestant right to think and the personal right and duty of belief; but she soon limits them by the asserted "power of the Church to decree rites and ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith." When, however, this power of the Church comes to be tested, it is found to be cumbersome, costly and vexatious in its processes, and utterly uncertain in its results. Convocation has wisely been long divested of legislative functions co-ordinate with those of Parliament; the canons of the Church, happily, have never become statute law; and the Court of Arches, when appealed to on matters of doctrine, is evidently perplexed to decide what the doctrine of the Church *is*, at least on some points.

And no wonder. With all the precision and rigour that mark some of the Articles, there is the greatest vagueness of expression in others; and if all Churchmen agreed in wishing to find out what the Church really requires them to believe (instead of finding that it allows them to believe according to their own various fancies), it might be difficult to decide what that bounden belief is.

There is no part of the Church Articles so vague as that which relates to the canonicity and inspiration of the Scriptures. Whether it be that at the time of their formation there was no active controversy raging on these subjects and requiring to be stilled by authority (for Church Articles have generally arisen out of the active presence of heresy), or whether the diversity of opinion prevailing on the subject was such as to dictate a prudential silence, may be matter of opinion. We are inclined to think the former was the case when the Articles were first drawn in Edward's reign; and the latter, there is little doubt, was the case on their last revision by authority in 1662. The fact, however, is undeniable, and has been made conspicuous in the proceedings of the Court of Arches, that the Church of England propounds no clear test of canonicity, and offers no definition whatever of what is to be believed respecting the inspiration of scripture. In the sixth Article it is said: "In the name of holy scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority *was never any doubt* in the Church." Then the books of the Old Testament are very imperfectly enumerated (and those of the Apocrypha also, as fit to be read for "example of life and instruction of manners," but not for establishing "any doctrine"); but, instead of an enumeration of the books of the New Testament, it is then added: "All the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them canonical." Nothing could be more slovenly and confused than this. "Books as commonly received." What precision of cataloguing! Then the first quoted clause contradicts the last, for (as everybody knows, from Eusebius downwards) there are some few books in the New Testament of whose authority there *has always been doubt* in the Church, and which are therefore not canonical according to the first clause, yet are proclaimed canonical in the last. There is no assertion here,—far less definition or description,—of Inspiration as belonging to the Holy Scriptures.

Yet precisely upon this part of theology (truly the foundation of the rest), where the Church formularies are least explicit, the common orthodoxy both of Church and Dissent is the most absolute, dogmatical and narrow. The verbal and plenary inspiration of the Scriptures is popularly assumed as indisputable; and every concession to common sense and to the plain literary facts of the case is looked upon as a concession to heresy. But even in the Court of Arches this concession was reluctantly made by Dr. Phillimore, after seeming to assume the literal inspiration; and leave was given by the Judge to the defendant, Dr. Rowland Williams, to dispute the authorship of the Second Epistle of Peter, without, we presume, violating its *canonicity*, as decreed by the Church.

Whether this vagueness of the Articles would allow Dr. Colenso

to assign the authorship of the Pentateuch to Samuel and a later writer unknown, without rebuke from Dr. Lushington (if Dr. Lushington *could* be called on to try a Bishop's orthodoxy), we cannot pretend to say; but we do not know why it might not. The Articles, we repeat, are singularly vague and lax on these foundation questions of biblical learning; and for anything that appears to the contrary, a clerical student is perfectly free to pursue all such inquiries and to avow even their doctrinal results, with this perilous limitation: that *if the results clash with any dogma of the Creeds, Articles or Liturgy, he is liable to prosecution*, not for his process, nor exactly for his result, but *for any avowal of such result.* How cruel is this condition of things! How galling to every liberal mind! What a temptation to mean and temporizing conformity!

But it is time to enter upon the examination of the Bishop of Natal's second volume. In this, as in the first (see C. R. p. 26), the Preface forms by far the most interesting of the contents. He alludes to some of his reviewers, and justifies his desire to enlist the intelligent laity in the assertion of biblical freedom, and in the attempt to preserve the English Church from impending, if not actually growing, degradation. He makes powerful use of a table lately published by the Bishop of Winchester, which shews how rapidly the proportion of candidates for orders from Oxford and Cambridge is diminishing, and that of men from St. Aidan's, Birkenhead, and other *literates*, is increasing year by year; so that the latter, from being in 1841 not one-fifteenth of the whole, were in 1861 considerably more than a third! And as a specimen of the theological training of St. Aidan's, he quotes from "Dr. Baylee's *verbal inspiration*," such stupidly dangerous orthodoxy as this: "The Bible cannot be less than verbally inspired. *Every word, every syllable, every letter, is just what it would be, had God spoken from heaven without any human intervention.*" "*Every scientific statement is infallibly accurate*," &c. Surely these are signs of danger to the Church of England which ought to awaken our statesmen, if the hierarchy can still shut their eyes to them. The Bishop of Natal says:

"The circumstances of the times are such, that those, who know the facts of the case, dare not be silent any longer, while yet it is possible, by a timely recognition of the truth, and by adopting wise and liberal measures suited to the present emergency, to save the Church of England from the ruin which threatens her. It was only a *question of time* whether these results of critical inquiry should be brought to the knowledge of English Churchmen in this our own day or in the days of the next generation. There is yet a season in which we may work together, before her evils have become incurable and her downfall certain, to throw down the barriers, which at present shut out from the National Church so many men of learning, and genius, and piety, who might be numbered among her strongest friends, and to get rid of those dogmatic

fetters, by which the young men of promise, at each of our Universities, refuse any longer to be bound."—P. xxv.

"If the arguments here stated can be fairly set aside, most gladly will I acknowledge my fault before the Church, and submit to the just consequences of my acts. But, if they shall appear to be well founded and true, I appeal once more to the English Laity to look to their own religious liberties, and the interests of the Truth, and to set on foot such measures, as may seem best, for obtaining through the action of Parliament, on whose decisions the system of our National Church depends, such relief for the consciences of the Clergy as shall give room for the free utterance of God's truth in the Congregation, instead of the worn-out formulæ of a bygone age. Can we not trust God's Truth to take care of itself in this world? Must we seek, in our ignorant feeble way, to prop it up by legal enactments, and fence it round by a system of fines and forfeitures and Church anathemas, lest the rude step of some 'free inquirer' should approach too near, and do some fatal injury to the Eternal Truth of God? *Have we no faith in God, the Living God?* And do we not believe that He himself is willing, and surely able as willing, to protect His own honour, and to keep in safety the souls of His children, and, amidst the conflict of opinion that will ever be waged in this world in the search after truth,—which may be vehement but need not be uncharitable,—to maintain in each humble, prayerful, heart the essential substance of that Truth, which 'maketh wise unto salvation'? Surely, as a friend has written—'To suppose that we can serve God's cause by shutting our eyes to the light, much more to suppose that we can serve it by asserting that we *see* what we do *not* see, because we *wish* to see it, is simply *intellectual Atheism.*'"—P. xxxv.

The personal position of Dr. Colenso (and of other men in clerical, though not episcopal, functions who take the same broad view of what a National Church *ought* to be) is a very questionable one in the eyes of their fellow-citizens and must be very painful to themselves. The downright Nonconformist may say, Why do they not leave the Church at once? and may at any rate think himself happy not to be under their temptation to conform. But he must not judge too harshly of them; and he may even endeavour to appreciate their conduct as from their own point of view. Would it not be far better to *nationalize* the Church of England than to secularize it or make a scramble of its possessions? Liberal Churchmen at least must think so. And without vindicating that worldly conformity which submits without conviction, remonstrance or attempt at improvement, we may at least understand those who stay in the Church in order actively to help on its reform. They rest, so to speak, on its unwritten *common law* as a Protestant body, and claim the vigorous reform of its obsolete, restrictive and oppressive *statutes*. We cannot presume to say this is inconsistent or immoral on the part of those who once sincerely believed with the Church, but have begun to doubt her perfect wisdom and knowledge. But what course shall such men take as priests and bishops still ministering at her altar? How shall they continue to use liturgical

services which imply ideas believed in by the Church some centuries ago, but now disproved by modern science? Dr. Colenso answers boldly: "I see no remedy but to *omit such words*" (as many clergymen notoriously omit the Athanasian Creed); "to disobey the law of the Church on this point, and take the consequences of the act—should any over-zealous brother-clerk or layman drag them before a court and enforce a penalty in the face of an indignant nation" (p. xxii).

We wish the nation would shew itself a little more actively indignant, not at the persecutions, but at the law which invites them, and more actively determined to nationalize its own Church.

The contents of this second part of the inquiry into the Pentateuch embrace a somewhat larger critical range than those of the first. That part was confined to the arithmetical difficulties of the Exodus; and we expressed ourselves (C. R., pp. 24, 25) as dissatisfied with the Bishop's conclusions, inasmuch as he makes the exaggeration of numbers decisive against the historical character of the record; whereas we should, after giving up the exaggerated numbers, feel that the history was thereby become credible. The part now before us is occupied with the *Elohim and Jehovah* argument.

It is nothing new to our readers to be informed that these two names for the Supreme Being, *Elohim* (God) and *Jehovah* (Lord in the English version), respectively mark certain portions of Genesis; and, more particularly, that in the *double* account of the creation and the *double* account of the deluge, one of these names distinctly marks the one account and the other the other. Hence it has long been understood that the Pentateuch is a composite work, either made up of two original documents (which we may call the *Elohim* document and the *Jehovah* document), put together by a third writer, or else made up by a writer whom we may call the *Jehovist*, with the help of an older *Elohim* document before him (for various reasons tend to shew that the Elohim document was probably the older of the two). This critical idea is as old as Eichorn, who thought that Moses was the compiler of Genesis from two more ancient documents, and the writer of the rest of the Pentateuch.

Others have since endeavoured to separate Genesis (and the following books also) into their *Elohistic* and *Jehovistic* parts. A tempting task, no doubt, to self-reliant and ingenious critics; but an impracticable one, because the Divine name does not occur in all parts with sufficient frequency to supply the test, and because also there are many places in which the various readings of MSS. and ancient versions render it impossible to say whether *Jehovah* or *Elohim* was originally written. Besides which, the very theory of one history made from two or more combined sources, implies the *rejection and loss* of many parts of

one or another, defying the reproduction of the original parts by analysis.

Dr. Colenso endeavours, by this test, to decide the age and authorship of the different parts of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua. And his conclusion (let it at once be stated) is, that Samuel wrote the *Elohistic* portions, and some person unknown, in the reign of David or Solomon, the *Jehovistic* parts; in fact completing the whole. He thinks Samuel was probably the inventor of the name Jehovah (and not Moses its first herald, as generally believed). And with this conviction, he repeats more strongly than before, that the Pentateuch is not historical. Let us trace his arguments, for we at least are free to do so without incurring ecclesiastical censure.

He refers to the passage in Exodus (vi. 3—5) where the Divine Being is represented as saying to Moses: "I am JEHOVAH; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob, by the name God Almighty; but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them. Yet I established my covenant with them, and gave them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage wherein they were strangers. And now I have also heard the groaning of the children of Israel whom the Egyptians keep in bondage; and I have remembered my covenant."

He asks (as many have done before him) how this passage can be reconciled with the preceding history in the books of Genesis and Exodus, according to which the Divine Being *had been known* to the patriarchs as Jehovah, and had been spoken of under the same name by this historian in previous chapters.

This seeming inconsistency is indeed so palpable, that we cannot think it could be unobserved by the writer himself, who has used the sacred name already in the pages just preceding that which *seems* to say the name had never been used till then! Is not the discrepancy more apparent than real? There are two ways of explaining it, either of which might be satisfactory.

The commonest and least learned or critical explanation is that which bids us dwell on the *meaning* of the name Jehovah. In ch. iii., when Moses first receives his divine commission, he is represented as saying to Him whose presence was symbolized in the burning bush: "Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them?" Then the record pursues: "And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM (or, as many prefer translating, I WILL BE THAT WHICH I WILL BE). And he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I WILL BE hath sent me unto you." "Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, JEHOVAH, HE WHO WILL BE, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you. This is my name for ever, and this my

memorial unto all generations." The *memorial* implied in this name, and not the mere name itself, is (according to this interpretation) understood to be what is now to become matter of experimental knowledge to the Israelites, though not so known to their fathers. He who was God Almighty to the patriarchs will shew himself as God Jehovah to their descendants, as the *Faithful One* whose promises stand fast. Learned and good men have been satisfied with this interpretation, as explaining how the name Jehovah might have been in occasional use among the ancestors of the Mosaic generation, in addition to the more frequent term *(Elohim)* God, and its occasional adjunct, Almighty, and yet as justifying the direction to Moses to use the term Jehovah henceforth, as the specific name of Him who was now about to rescue his people from their bondage in Egypt and bring them into the land promised to their fathers. For our own part, we have never felt that this was less than a sufficient explanation, on the assumption that the name Jehovah *was* really used before the time of Moses.

But the second explanation takes the record before us as literally meaning that the name had not been in use at all till Moses proclaimed it to the Jews in Egypt; that neither Abraham, nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any others, had till that time used the name. It is found indeed in the earlier pages of the record; in Genesis repeatedly, and in the third chapter of Exodus before the asserted revelation of it. But if the record was not written till the time of Moses (to whom it is generally ascribed), there is no difficulty in understanding that a writer to whom the name Jehovah was as familiar as that of God Almighty, and to whom it had become the term of peculiar reverence and trust, might, in writing the earlier history, make use of this name even when speaking of the patriarchal times, never imagining that a critical difficulty or an historical doubt would be hung upon his practice. He might even, if with critical care he tried to use historically the only name historically appropriate, sometimes *involuntarily* fall into the use of the other name, which to him was the more familiar or the more endeared. "Nothing is more common (says Dr. Geddes in his notes on the passage) than such a *prolepsis*" (or anticipatory use of a term not historically appropriate to the time). "Who scruples to say that the excellent *Prelections on Hebrew Poetry* were written by Bishop Lowth, although we know he was no Bishop when he composed that work? or that Pope Benedict XIV. was author of a celebrated work, *De Canonisatione Sanctorum*, although he was only Cardinal Lambertini when he wrote it?" Even schoolboys may remember that, according to Virgil, Æneas at the end of the sixth book lands at Cajeta; yet in the seventh book we are told that the place got its name Cajeta *afterwards*, from Æneas's nurse, who died and was buried there! Was Virgil unconscious of the prolepsis? Or did ancient historians and

poets consciously allow themselves more latitude in this respect than our critical notions quite approve? According to these illustrations, it is perfectly conceivable, at any rate, that Moses himself, when writing of times long preceding the revelation of the name of Jehovah to him, might use it both consciously and unconsciously where not historically appropriate according to strict modern criticism. This second explanation goes to the root of the critical difficulty; and as the presumed impossibility of such a *prolepsis* is the foundation-stone of Dr. Colenso's critical argument, we must here refer yet more distinctly to Geddes's thorough-searching note on the passage (Ex. vi. 3). He states the question with perfect freedom, and examines *seriatim* "all the places where the patriarchs, from Adam to Jacob inclusively, have directly mentioned the name *Jehovah*." "They are certainly more than enough (he says) to prove that the name was known before the vocation of Moses, if we were sure that they had actually spoken the very words put in their mouths by the compilers or copiers of the Pentateuch. But who will affirm that this is the case? The number of places where *Elohim* and *Jehovah* have been interchanged is very great, and the variety of lection between the versions and the text, and between the copies of the text itself, is astonishing. Need we wonder, then, that the word *Jehovah*, once become the peculiar name of the God of the Hebrews, should by historians posterior to that period be often substituted for the more ancient and more general name *Elohim*, even in addresses to the Deity, or in relations concerning him? A prolepsis is readily granted with respect to the latter; and we must either grant it with respect to the former, or say that the writer of Exodus is in contradiction with the writer of Genesis; for it is, in my apprehension, impossible to reconcile the passage of Exodus that gave rise to the above observations, with the name *Jehovah's* being known to the preceding patriarchs."

Nothing can be more thorough-going than these observations. We are disposed to wonder, and somewhat to complain, that in the theological treatises by which the present day is continually startled, reference should seldom, if ever, be made to any of the free utterances of English theologians, or to their suggested explanations of scripture difficulties. The vagueness of many of these treatises contrasts with the definiteness of the older writers, as strikingly as the ultra scepticism of others does with the moderation of older English heresies. One would not know, from the theological combatants of this day, that there had ever been a Geddes among English Catholics, or that there had been and still was such a school of thought as Unitarianism. It seems the best hope of the latter (as it was the experience of the advocates of free-trade) that they may see the world gradually adopting their principles without acknowledgment, till in due time everybody shall say, Of course it is so; we always thought

so; everybody is a Unitarian. But it is rather disappointing, meanwhile, to see extreme views battling together without any recognition of what we have long ago found the point of reconciliation between religion and science.

It is new to English theology, we believe, to attempt the precise settlement of the age and authorship of the Pentateuch by the *Elohim and Jehovah* test. Opinion has been always divided on these subjects, varying from the undiscriminating assertion of its purely Mosaic authorship down to that of the foolish Jewish legend in Esdras, which makes the Law to have been lost during the captivity and re-written (by inspiration) by Ezra on the return. It is so common among critics to regard Deuteronomy as a separable and later work, and the reasons for so regarding it are so palpable, that it is surprising to see the whole treated by Dr. Colenso without this discrimination. We shall now, however, state his theory in his own words and review his leading "proofs."

"For the present (he says, p. 228), it may suffice to say, anticipating thus far the result of our future investigations, that the earliest, or Elohistic document, which is the groundwork of the whole, and which, provisionally and tentatively, we may ascribe to Samuel, seems now to form about one half of the book of Genesis, a small part of Exodus, still less of Numbers, a very small portion of Deuteronomy, and about the same of Joshua,—in short, considerably less than a sixth part of the whole six books. The Elohistic word 'Shaddai' (Almighty), which occurs *six* times in Genesis, is found only *once* in Exodus (vi. 3), twice in Numbers (xxiv. 4, 16), and not at all in Leviticus, Deuteronomy, or Joshua,—a fact, which may serve to indicate how small a portion of these latter books belongs to the Elohist."

Again:

"May it not be possible that the Elohist wrote at a time, when the word was quite new and fresh-coined,—when it had only just been introduced, perhaps, by himself, as the *national* Personal Name for the Divine Being, with the view of drawing more distinctly the line of demarcation between the people of Israel,—now first gathered under a king, and no longer living in scattered, separate, tribes,—and the idolatrous nations round them? May not the Elohistic writer, wishing to enforce the adoption of this strange Name, have composed for the purpose this portion of the Mosaic story, while the later Jehovist,—writing when the Name, though not, perhaps, even yet in common every-day use, was beginning to be more generally known, and was, at all events, familiar to himself,—uses it freely from the first, without perceiving, or, at least, *without feeling very strongly*, the contradiction thereby imported into the narrative, as, in fact, he did not perceive that his insertion in G. ii. contradicted G. i., and that in G. vii. contradicted G. vi., and so in many other instances, of which we shall have to take account hereafter?

"In fact, from what we have already seen of the unhistorical character, generally, of the account of the Exodus, we have no longer any reason for supposing it to be necessary to believe that the name Jehovah

really originated in the way described in E. vi. Yet it must have originated in *some* way,—at some time or other,—in the real history of the Hebrew people, just as the Zulu Name for the Creator, Unkulunkulu, 'the Great-Great-One,' must have been first used by some one, in some part or other of *their* past history. Is it not *possible*, then, that the Name Jehovah may have been first employed by Samuel, in order to mark more distinctly the difference between the Elohim of the Hebrews and the Elohim of the nations round them, and make it more difficult for them to fall away to the practice of idolatry?

"Certainly, it would be much more easy and natural to suppose, if that were not contradicted by the actual evidence in the case before us, that Samuel, or whoever else composed the Elohistic document, *found* the Name already in use among his people, and with some legendary traditions attached to it, as to the way in which it was first made known to them by Moses, during their march through the wilderness. If it were right to wish any such fact of history to be other than it really is, one would rather *desire* such a solution of the present difficulty, and gladly embrace it. But a firm and honest adherence to the plain results of critical enquiry, as set forth in the following chapters, will not allow of our making this supposition. They seem to compel us to the conclusion, that the Name was quite new to the Hebrew people in the days of Samuel; and, if so, we can scarcely avoid the inference that he himself must have first introduced it.

"In that case, he may have written the account of the revelation to Moses in E. iii., as we suppose, or else in E. vi., with the view of accounting for the origin of the Name, and may have carefully abstained from using it in his narrative, until it was thus, as it were, introduced with authority. We may conceive that the sheets of parchment or papyrus, on which the old Seer had inscribed, as best he could, the early annals of the Hebrew history, were left at his death,—*unfinished*, probably,—in the hands of the members of his 'School,' for whose instruction, in fact, they were, as we suppose, composed in the first instance, though their Teacher's large and patriotic mind would embrace, no doubt, the whole population of the land, whom he hoped gradually to reach by means of their influence.

"This unfinished work, then, would fall naturally into the custody of some disciple of Samuel, one of the 'Prophets' of his 'School,' such, for instance, as Nathan or Gad,—not exactly, therefore, a *contemporary* of the Seer, so as to have shared in his counsels from the first, and to have taken a deep personal interest in the original plan,—and yet living at a time so near to *his* time, that the Name, Jehovah, though well-known to those of higher mind, as David and the Prophets and Priests of his age, was not yet thoroughly *popularised*, was not, therefore, used as familiarly as the old name Elohim, in the common speech of the people at large, nor compounded freely in their Proper Names. And he, who had already, perhaps, witnessed the actual growth of the history under his master's hands, and had imbibed, we may suppose, some portion of his spirit, might very properly seek to carry on and perfect so interesting and useful a work; he might even have been charged by the dying Seer himself to do so.

"Accordingly, he may have done his best to this end, making additions here and there from any sources at his command, illustrating

amending, enlarging, and, perhaps, at times abridging, the original story, and filling up the latter portion of the narrative, which was left, perhaps, altogether incomplete. Such a writer as this, accustomed from his youth upwards, as one of Samuel's pupils, to use habitually, in his common discourse, the name Jehovah, as the Proper Name of the God of Israel, might not think it necessary to adhere to the peculiarity which marked the earlier narrative, but might use the name Jehovah freely from the first, and might, indeed, desire, or think it best, to represent it as a Name known to pious worshippers from a very early age."—Pp. 261—264.

One cannot forbear observing that the theory is very precise and positive in its details, though confessedly matter of conjecture. It strikes us too as somewhat whimsical that the alleged inventor of the name Jehovah should be regarded as the author of the *Elohim* document. That the name must have originated in *some* way, as well as the name Unkulunkulu, is highly probable; but that very *naïve* observation does not decide between the claims of Moses and Samuel to have first proclaimed it. Nor does Dr. Colenso attempt to explain how the name should have been accepted by the nation at the suggestion of Samuel, and the Mosaic origin of it accepted also, if up to that time there had been no Pentateuch, no Law, no national history, no national worship. Least of all does he account for the *journal* form of many parts of the *story*. Whether he would call such a proceeding on the part of Samuel by any milder name than forgery or imposture, we do not know; but such an account of the matter seems to us to place the Pentateuch, not only out of the pale of history, but beneath respect as an honest collection of traditions. Still the Bishop admits, in various hints, that "real facts may lie at the basis of the narrative," that it is "highly probable that Moses may be an historical character," &c. He does not deny "that the Israelites did leave Egypt and remain for a time in the wilderness of Sinai, under circumstances which produced a profound impression on the national character," and that some great event held in tradition by the people "may have given to the Elohist the idea of his work and been made by him the basis of his story."

One thing he makes abundantly clear against the common bibliolatry. The fact of the two documents "proves that the original Elohistic document was not considered so venerable and sacred by the second writer, whoever he may have been, in whatever age he may have lived, that he was restrained by any religious fears or scruples from meddling with it,—from altering, enlarging or curtailing it, at his own pleasure, and mixing up with it, as of equal value, his own composition. Even if *both* were divinely inspired to an equal degree, yet it must seem strange that one inspired writer should take such liberties with another, believed to be divinely infallible,—that one man, under

the guidance of the Holy Spirit, should amend, add to or erase in this way, portions of a story, which either was, or was believed to be, in its every letter and word, of Divine original, and as such, of absolute, immutable authority." (Pp. 177, 178.)

We can only say, Let the galled jade wince! The bibliolater has no reply to this. The books were not so thought of in the times when they were composed. Such inspiration is not claimed by their writers. But then it is not quite fair that Dr. Colenso should use the argument founded upon this modern superstition (as he often does) in favour of his own conclusions: "It cannot be supposed that any later writers would have presumed," &c. "It is inconceivable that any pious Israelite would have dared such profanity," &c. They did dare it, without profanity, as our author has again and again shewn. And those who maintain, in the only rational sense of that term, the *Mosaic* authorship of the Pentateuch, or the first four books, not only maintain the compilation of Genesis from previously existing documents and traditions, but regard various passages of the next three books as subsequent additions, and have no hesitation in believing them to have undergone successive revisions and modifications from time to time.

But the specialty of Dr. Colenso's argument — whether its strength or its weakness—remains to be noticed. He presses the book of Psalms into his service, and endeavours to make out that Elohistic psalms are usually the oldest, as belonging to the times preceding Samuel and including David's earlier poems; that the use of Jehovah grows during David's time, and prevails more and more afterwards, though he seems to think that there are late Elohistic psalms also, and suggests that the usage may have been again reversed during the captivity in Babylon. The Psalms (as most of us know) are arranged in five books or portions, ending respectively with the 41st, the 72nd, the 89th, the 106th and the 150th; these divisions being marked by doxologies, and in the second instance by this note: "The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended." Dr. Colenso agrees with critics in general in saying, "There can be no doubt that the whole collection was formed *gradually*, Book i. having been first formed, and then Book ii. &c." Of course he finds, as we all do, some old psalms in the later books, but scarcely recent ones in the earliest books. He takes the title, "A Psalm of David," as usually but not invariably reliable. Then, with a patience worthy of Alexander Cruden himself (or of his own arithmetical computations in his Part I.), he sets forth the Elohim and Jehovah statistics of the whole collection, distinguishing in columns the number of times that they are respectively used in each psalm, and adding in a third column the number of times that *Adonai* (Lord, in small letters) is used. He then collects the *averages*

for each book as follows (for we cannot trouble the reader with all the figures):

Book i. contains Jehovah *four* times to Elohim *once*.
Book ii. contains Elohim *six* times to Jehovah *once*.
Book iii. { Psalms of Asaph contain Elohim *four* times to Jehovah *once*.
Other Psalms contain Jehovah *three* times to Elohim *twice*.
Book iv. contains Jehovah *four* times to Elohim *once*.
Book v. contains Jehovah *seven* times to Elohim *once*.

It is on the psalms of Book ii. and the *Psalms of Asaph* in Book iii. that the critic builds his argument for the prevalence of Elohim in the early part of David's life. But we confess ourselves at a loss how to reconcile with his argument the Jehovistic character of Book i. And though the system of averages may be very useful on many occasions, we cannot admit it here, as, in certain psalms of each class, a mixed or even reversed usage is found. Thus among the so-called *Jehovah* psalms of Book v. we have occasional instances of 6 to 1, 2 to 1, 3 to 3 in the reverse proportion; and in Book i., where we find 6 Elohims to 7 Jehovahs, or 11 to 16, we must give up the idea that the one term excluded the other from mind in the poets of each period. So the Elohistic psalms (so-called) present us sometimes with the proportion of 3 Jehovahs against 7 Elohims, 2 against 6, 2 against 8, 2 against 3, 5 against 10, 3 against 9. Can we, in the face of such exceptions, presume to read a rule of mathematical accuracy? Do poets' thoughts admit of averaging? Is it improbable or unnatural that the same Hebrew bard who could use the two divine names almost with equal frequency in one psalm, might in another be quite Jehovistic and in a third intirely Elohistic? Some very minute critics have indeed endeavoured to shew a reason why in each case the one word was preferred to the other, as arising from the nature of the subject. But if such an attempt is labour lost, is it less so to endeavour to date the Psalms by the test of these names? Is not the clever and self-reliant scholar in each instance yielding to the fascinating temptation of pushing conjecture into certainty, and hanging upon a very subtle thread of argument conclusions too weighty to be fairly sustained by it? So indeed we cannot but feel. Such arguments are "too clever by half;" too subtle for us to feel sure that we have all the facts clearly before us in one view, or to trust our own critical discernment in pronouncing judgment.

We ourselves hold a much higher view of the essential authenticity and general credibility of the Pentateuch, while not wishing to dissemble a single difficulty, but rather wondering to think that any persons should be surprised to meet with difficulties, perplexities and contradictions. If it were not that very few people have carefully read the Bible through, the dogmatic theory of its literal and universal inspiration could not be held

even in appearance. But the truth of poetry and feeling seem to us to vouch for that of the history in assigning the first use of the name Jehovah, as a memorial name, to Moses rather than to Samuel. If there is, as we firmly believe, and as Dr. Colenso does not altogether deny (though he asserts it vaguely and problematically), a broad and firm basis of fact in the story of the Exodus, when stripped of its exaggerated numbers and looked at through the diminishing glass of historical criticism which we apply to all other ancient histories and traditions; if, as we believe, a great part of it may be claimed as the contemporary record of the times when the Jews emerged from Egypt to become a nation in Palestine; if we assign to these venerable books an authorship far higher than Samuel, and thereby believe their authorship to be free from deliberate fraud (which could hardly be said in ascribing them to Samuel); if we make the largest allowance that can be required for the revisions of successive editors (Samuel included and Ezra too), for the carelessness of transcribers, the annotations of readers, and all the indescribable ravages of time;—we still seem to trace plainly along the course of these ancient books the progress of revealed knowledge at every step from Adam to Moses, from Moses through the prophets to Christ; and the great Mosaic step in that history was, to have advanced from the knowledge of *God Almighty* to the knowledge of *God All-faithful.* If the origin of the latter title be disputed, the history of the Exodus remains; or if even that history be thought scarcely historical, the tradition at least remains, in which it is granted there is the basis of fact, that this people, when setting forth to realize the mysterious hope received from their fathers, were taught to initiate their enterprize by using thenceforth as the distinctive name of their God (whether occasionally used before or not) that which designated him the Jehovah of the future, who will fulfil in the next ensuing years the sacred promises of the past. This is the initial discipline of faith; of that faith which substantiates the future and realizes the unseen. How thoughtlessly do we Christians use that emphatic name, or how easily let it slip from notice under its inadequate representation in our common Bible! It should be our star of religious hope, as it was to the Jews, to say: Jehovah reigneth, let the earth rejoice. By that name we know Him as the *Living God,* HIM WHO IS, though all the idols of the nations are vanity and a lie; Him who is, self-existent, all-present, ever nigh to our thought and feeling. By that name we know HIM THAT WAS, from everlasting the Maker and Guide of all the generations of men; and our thoughts look back on the progress of the human race as His will and work. By that name we know HIM THAT WILL BE; and our thoughts of the future are taught to take counsel of His will and rest upon His promises. And if we can, as Christians, add to the successive titles of God

Almighty and God Jehovah, the title taught by our Master when he bade us pray, saying, Our Father, this diminishes nothing from the might nor from the faithfulness; but shews us that the directing soul of all that might and all that reliableness is Love,—a Heavenly Father's love.

One word of mixed respect for the author and regret for his work, in conclusion. He has, perhaps more than any of the *Essayists and Reviewers*, suddenly *popularized* some of those questions which have hitherto been reserved for students. The reverse of wrong is not always right; but to popularize these discussions (in a very rough way) is the natural reaction against the enjoined popular belief on authority. If we have presumed to think his verbal criticism too confident and one-sided, and his conclusions too weighty to hang upon so fine-spun a thread; if we think him rash and destructive since his new and somewhat late studies in theology, in proportion as he was, by his own confession, passive and ignorant in his episcopal belief till that Zulu perplexed him by a mere child's question about Noah's ark, and sent him to the study of German theology for an answer,—we do not the less highly appreciate this man's frankness, moral courage and devotedness to the search after truth, nor the less earnestly hope that he may become a prominent means of bringing to a crisis of imperative reform the intellectual sluggishness, the hollow-heartedness and the moral obliquity of English conformity. He painfully shews, and his opponents in their way prove, the need of free thought and inquiry, the wrong of a doctrinal and exclusive Church, and the blessedness of a free Church, where, as in the free state hypothetically described by Tacitus, you may think your own thoughts freely and speak them honestly.

THE LATE MR. EDWARD TAYLOR.

In recording the death of Mr. Edward Taylor,* Gresham Professor of Music, and to our readers the well-known friend of civil and religious liberty, as well as of Unitarian Christianity, we cannot allow the event to pass by without a few words expressive of the high estimation in which his character was generally held, and which we feel to be alike due to the memory of the departed and the expectations of the living.

Mr. Taylor was born at Norwich in the year 1784, and as one of a family long resident and much respected in that ancient city, he inherited from them an honoured name, which from his youth he so well supported and sustained as to win for himself a high place in the esteem and regard of his fellow-citizens.

---

* He died at Brentwood on the 12th of March.

For his earliest instruction he was placed under the care of Mr. Houghton, the father of the late Rev. P. Houghton, for many years the eloquent minister of the Octagon chapel. On quitting school, and not having entered any of our colleges or public institutions, he was left very much to his own diligence in the pursuit of knowledge, stimulated and fostered by parents who were admirably qualified to give a right direction to his studies and to lead him on to an acquaintance with the writers of the golden age of English literature, of which, as it appeared in after life, he made so good a use. He very early evinced a decided love for music, and by studying it as a science gained that profound and exact knowledge of it for which he was afterwards distinguished. In the intervals of business it formed his favourite and most delightful recreation. And when, owing to the changes which had taken place in a particular branch of the Norwich trade for which he was intended, he was induced to leave his native city and remove to London, and where finding his expectations again disappointed, he at once availed himself of his great musical powers and acquirements to maintain and uphold that noble independence of character which marked him through life. He lectured on different occasions at the London Institution and various other institutions in the country, till at length a vacancy having occurred in the Gresham Professorship of Music, he was immediately chosen as the fittest person to fill that important chair, which so entirely accorded with his inclinations and tastes. Desirous of discharging the duties of his office honestly and efficiently, and with a view to render his lectures more widely useful by attracting a larger audience than had been wont to attend, he resolved to change the time of meeting from the morning, as was formerly the custom, to the evening. The experiment was completely successful. The lecture-room soon became crowded with attentive hearers, who listened with delight to the eloquent discourse of the lecturer, made all the more interesting and intelligible by the vocal illustrations with which it was accompanied. As a further relief to the scientific part of the subject, he not unfrequently introduced into his lectures matters of history, biography and even anecdote, all which, together with his fine and expressive reading, especially of poetry, could not fail of adding greatly to their popularity. Before, however, entering regularly on his theme, he delivered three inaugural lectures, in the first of which he set forth the nature of the work before him, and what was to be expected of him. "My desire," said he, "will be to render the Gresham Music Lectures a source of rational amusement as well as instruction. They were designed to be popular, and it is my wish to make them so; but let me not be misunderstood. They were designed to be popular, for the general use and advantage of the citizens of London, and not for the sole benefit of a class of musical students,—popular,

as intended for the people, and not merely for the profession,—popular, as designed to be conveyed in language intelligible to the many, and not veiled in the technical phraseology of a science understood only by a few." The next two lectures are mainly devoted to a history of the life and times of Sir T. Gresham, with especial reference to music. They testify to the great research which must have been employed in collecting the materials for this purpose, and are besides beautifully written. We cannot but regret that one who could write so well has not obliged the public by writing more. It may be hoped, however, that some of his lectures, or portions of them, may have been left in a state not unfit for publication.

After a while, he published, in conjunction with Mr. Turle, the organist of Westminster Abbey, the People's Music-book, the first part of which consists of a collection of psalm and hymn tunes, excluding all airs originally written to secular words, and concerning which he says: "It is much to be regretted that an unadvised remark of John Wesley should have sanctioned the introduction of airs originally written to profane words into the service of the house of God." He was also the editor of various oratorios, including that of the Last Judgment of Spohr, which we remember to have been performed at one of the great Norwich festivals. Some of the madrigals of Italy of the 16th century he also brought into notice, and were adapted by himself to English words. While no one enjoyed more than he did the full cathedral service, he was strongly opposed to the modern practice of chanting in parish and other similar churches. He considered it as a clear departure from all rule and propriety. Chanting, in his view, belonged essentially to the cathedral alone.

Reverting now to his residence in the city of Norwich, where he was long a member of the corporate body and once sheriff, we are reminded of the part which he took in all the great questions of the day relating to civil and religious liberty. Though ranked among the leading reformers of the place,—to his honour be it said,—he never disgraced the cause of reform by countenancing that system of bribery and corruption which at one time so generally prevailed at the municipal and general elections. Against such a practice he steadily set his face, and denounced its degrading and demoralizing tendency. He would never go with the party with whom he commonly acted when they tampered with the consciences of their fellow-men, and sought to obtain political success by means totally inconsistent with their true principles. Victory obtained at such a price was no cause of exultation with him, but rather of shame and reproach. He was ready to rejoice as heartily as any one when the battle in favour of freedom was fairly fought and honourably won, but not when it was obtained through stratagem and fraud. And so he felt and acted on all occasions.

He was a thorough Nonconformist in principle as well as by descent, but would never lend himself to any proceedings which savoured of sectarian narrowness and exclusiveness. Associating with men of various creeds and professions, he was not the less respected and esteemed by them for the firmness and consistency with which he avowed and held his own. As evidence of his true conception of the rights belonging to the freedom and expression of opinion, it may be mentioned that at the time when the prosecution of unbelievers for their attacks on the Christian religion had become very frequent, he, with liberal-minded men of other persuasions, met and drew up a petition to the House of Lords against those arbitrary and ill-judged proceedings; rightly considering that Christianity needed no such weapons for her defence, and that she would be far better protected by letting her alone, relying on her own inherent strength and power to meet and repel such vain and puny assaults. Accordingly, a deputation was formed to wait on Dr. Bathurst, then Bishop of Norwich, and to request that he would have the kindness to present and support the prayer of the petition. To this, after some little hesitation, he replied, "Mr. Taylor,"—through whom the petition had passed into his hands,—"what you ask of me is a very trying thing for a Bishop of the Established Church to do; but, satisfied as I am that religious liberty cannot with effect be claimed for any one, except for reasons which would extend it alike to all, I will comply with your wishes and give the petition my support."

At an early period of his life, our departed friend shewed a strong desire to acquaint himself with the grounds of the religious profession in which he had been brought up; and through the kindness of Dr. Enfield, who was interested by his thirst for knowledge, he was supplied with books and assisted by him in his inquiries. We need hardly say that these inquiries, conducted, as no doubt they were, in a right spirit and with an earnest desire to arrive at the truth, led him to embrace with greater confidence the faith of his fathers, and the faith, as it appears to us, that was once delivered to the saints. As a believer in the great distinguishing doctrines of Unitarian Christianity, he knew thoroughly the foundation on which they stood, and was always ready to profess and defend them. At the centenary anniversary of the Octagon chapel in the year 1855, he, notwithstanding his failing health, was present, to the great delight of many old friends, participating with them in all the interest of the occasion, and calling up, like them, the recollection of other days when they went to the house of God in company and worshiped together the one common Father of all. A few years more of his chequered life passed on, and as they were drawing to an end there were times when he experienced much severe suffering; but it is consoling to know that his last hours

were serene, peaceful and happy. His labours and trials are now over, and he has entered into his rest; but his memory survives, and long will it live in the hearts of his friends.

(From another Pen.)

Of the publications of the late Professor Taylor we are not able to offer a perfect list. But some of them are entitled to a respectful and honourable notice. The earliest with which we are acquainted is an Ode for Easter, words and music, which he "composed and compiled" for the "Songs of Miriam," published by Mr. Peck. In 1812, Mr. Taylor published "A Collection of Psalm Tunes," harmonized in four parts and adapted for congregational use. There had been long in use at the Octagon chapel in Norwich a Collection of Tunes published by his ancestor, Dr. John Taylor. The peculiarity of Mr. Edward Taylor's volume is, that the air is given to the tenor and an inner part to the treble voices. He adopted this principle, thinking it desirable that congregations should join in singing. Treble voices are rarely found in sufficient force or adequate training to lead a congregation. Mr. Taylor was something more than the editor of this useful and admirable Collection of Tunes, as he contributed no less than thirty-one tunes to the work, and other members of the Taylor family, 6. The tunes were adapted to words in the Collection of Hymns then recently published by his friend, Rev. Robert Aspland. When, after a lapse of thirty-two years, Mr. Taylor again appeared as the editor of a Collection of Psalm Tunes, it was in conjunction with Mr. Turle, and he in that work admitted only two of his own composition and a like number of his relative, the late Rev. Philip Taylor, of Dublin. In making this Collection, the editors bore in mind that in Protestant churches metrical psalmody should be the act of the congregation. They therefore avoided all needless difficulties in the construction of the harmony. The "People's Music Book," of which this Collection formed the first part, proved very successful, and many assurances reached the editors that it had helped to diffuse far and wide an acquaintance with the best classical music, and ministered to the innocent enjoyment of thousands of their fellow-countrymen. Of the Oratorios and other musical works in the publication of which Professor Taylor was concerned, we are unable to give a particular account.

As Gresham Professor of Music, he inaugurated his labours by the publication in 1838 of Three Lectures. This was a very creditable performance, evincing not only literary aptitude and skill, but some of the moral qualities which through life characterized Mr. Taylor. He exposed in terms of indignant censure the destruction by an act of the Legislature of the original Gresham College, and its conversion into an Excise office. The Gresham Lectures were and are delivered in an obscure corner

(a room in the Royal Exchange), at an inconvenient hour and in a dead tongue. Professor Taylor obtained for the delivery of his lectures the theatre of the City of London School. In accordance with the exemption granted from the first establishment of the College, the Professor of Music gave his lectures in English. The public did not fail to shew by a large attendance their appreciation of the public spirit and ability of the new Professor. With the creditable desire of doing honour to Music and its votaries, and removing from them the stigma of the want of classical learning, Mr. Taylor declined to avail himself of the exemption to which reference has been made. Like his colleagues, he prepared and delivered a lecture on Music at the accustomed place and in the Latin tongue. In the peroration of his Inaugural Lectures, he alluded to a long professional tour just brought to a close, during which he had addressed not less than 12,000 persons. It was the privilege of the writer of these lines to hear Mr. Taylor more than once in the course of that tour. Those lectures on Music, illustrated by well-executed specimens of early madrigals and other musical compositions, were admirable. As literary compositions, they possessed many recommendations, and ample justice was done to them in the nervous and sonorous delivery of the lecturer. The recitation of some lines from Milton the writer remembers as equally striking and admirable.

In connection with music, Mr. Taylor published, but without his name, a tract on the Cathedral Service in its glory and its decline. He viewed with strong disapprobation, as a breach of trust, the neglect in cathedral appointments of musical skill in the clergy. Without musical qualifications and cultivation, canons, prebendaries and others of the clergy in cathedrals, are incapable of adequately performing their prescribed duties as leaders in the daily service of the Church.

Often as Mr. Taylor was led to cathedrals by his love of music, and intimate as were his personal relations with clergymen of different ranks, he never forgot or let others be ignorant that he himself was a Unitarian. He agreed in his doctrinal views with the Rev. Thomas Madge and the late Rev. Robert Aspland, to both of whom he was united by the bonds of a close friendship. He was the author of a polemical tract entitled, "The Doctrine of the Trinity Indefensible." It was occasioned by a visitation sermon at Beccles by Rev. Thomas Sworde, of St. Mary's, Bungay, and was vigorous and scriptural in its argument. It found much favour both locally and generally. A second edition of it, printed in 1835, was incorporated by the Unitarian Association in its issue of Tracts in nine volumes (Vol. VI.). He also edited for the same Society Dr. John Taylor's "Defence of the Common Rights of Christians," and contributed to that publication an interesting Preface.

On the occasion of the service at the settlement of the Rev.

Edward Tagart, in 1825, as minister of the Octagon chapel, Norwich, Mr. Taylor was deputed by the congregation to speak the words of welcome to the new minister, and to explain the object of the service. Several admirable lay addresses were spoken about the same time at ordination services, and afterwards published. To none of these was Mr. Taylor's inferior. He carefully guards the religious liberty both of the pastor and the flock. His references to the opinions and characters of those eminent men who had previously ministered at the Octagon chapel, were just and felicitous. For many years he took an active share in the anniversary proceedings of Unitarian associations, both in his own county and in London; and whenever the tones of his powerful voice fell on the assembly, they knew that nothing would be said inconsistent with good sense and sterling principle. To the Monthly Repository and Christian Reformer he was an occasional contributor. Of his contributions to the former, we may specify as especially interesting a memoir of his father, which is printed in the 21st volume, pp. 482—494; while of those he sent to this periodical, we may instance two valuable articles contributed to our second volume (1846); the first entitled, "Some Unrecorded Passages in the Life of John Milton;" the second, "Henry Lawes, the Friend of Milton." The first was the substance of an address at the Non-con Club, of which Mr. Taylor was a valued member. He also contributed portions of the series of articles which appeared in the Christian Reformer (Vols. III. and IV.) on the History of the Octagon Chapel, Norwich.*

The latest public appearance of Professor Taylor was at a meeting of Nonconformists in Essex, near his residence at Brentwood, assembled to celebrate the Bicentenary anniversary. On that occasion a hymn composed by him in memory of the Two Thousand was sung. It may be mentioned as a proof of his liberality of feeling, that during the last years of his life, being precluded by distance from joining Unitarian worship, he attended the services of an Independent minister. Between this gentleman and himself there grew up, without on either side the sacrifice of principle or consistency, a warm feeling of regard. We owe to a short but interesting notice of Mr. Taylor in the *Inquirer* (March 21), the following genial passage, extracted from the *Guardian*, a well-known Church-of-England periodical:

"Those who recollect the Norwich festivals in former times will not easily forget his striking figure and fine independent bearing as he entered the orchestra, in company with the stars of the profession, or

* This series of papers was founded on a valuable MS. account left by Mr. John Taylor. The additions were in part from the pen of the editor of the Christian Reformer. The whole were, by his permission, reprinted from the type of this Magazine by Rev. J. Crompton; but he erroneously ascribed the whole of the additions to Professor Taylor, and forgot to mention the fact that the papers were a reprint from our Magazine.

the hearty round of applause with which he was always greeted by his fellow-townsmen. The Taylors were a manufacturing family of considerable influence in the days when Norwich was a manufacturing town, and the Professor used to tell, with considerable pride, how he and nine more of his name went up to the hustings in a body at the Reform Bill election to vote for the Liberal candidate for Norwich. When steam took the place of hand-looms, and the woollen manufacture migrated to the land of coal, Mr. Taylor found in music, which had been the amusement of his leisure hours, a substitute for the business which had ceased to be lucrative. His knowledge of the old classical music was profound, and his lectures, which he continued to deliver up to a very late period, were much admired. Those who had the privilege of his acquaintance will remember with regret the simple but hearty hospitality of his table, and the charm of his conversation, seasoned, as it was, with many an anecdote of the old times when Norwich was the centre of a little society of literary and liberal men, of whom he and other members of his family were not the least distinguished members."

THE DISTRESS IN DUKINFIELD.

Sir,

Since my last letter, the scene is all changed here. The workpeople, over-praised, have become discontented and almost fierce in their tone. Large indignation meetings have been held, angry resolutions have been passed, denouncing the distributors of relief, and hinting not very obscurely that violence would be resorted to if their demands were uncomplied with. These demands were, a larger weekly allowance of money; the adoption of some plan which would save them the trouble of waiting for it; a larger distribution of clothing, the quality to be improved and the brand no longer used; full liberty to all adults to employ their time as they thought proper, instead of being obliged to attend the schools; and, lastly, the admission of a certain number of working men on each Relief Committee, who would be able to check the extravagant salaries paid to officials and to secure an impartial distribution of clothing and money.

Such are the public complaints: privately, working men do not hesitate to remark without reserve about gentlemen who for months have devoted much of their time, and in many instances considerable sums of money, to their service, their belief that they are receiving large sums weekly from the public funds.

Believing that in making these statements they have been the dupes of insidious agitators, I offer the following history of our appointments. On the first institution of our Committee, all labours were gratuitous; the weight of them fell upon our invaluable Secretary, Mr. J. B. Kynder. For six months he gave us his services without fee or reward, and I am sure that every member of the Committee will agree with me that his rare administrative ability materially lightened the labours of his colleagues, and enabled the complicated machinery to work smoothly. The six months past, we found the business had assumed such gigantic proportions, that the sacrifice of leisure hours no longer sufficed, and we made a proposition to our Honorary Secretary to give up his pro-

fession and become our paid officer. This he consented to do, and we gave him £3 a-week. The clothing question now came on. Some eight thousand people had to be supplied. Every applicant, both for relief and clothes, had to be visited, the case inquired into, a report made to the Committee, and, if confirmed, a ticket issued and delivered at the house. Six paid visitors, with wages varying from 12*s.* to £1 a-week, were engaged. None of these were eligible as Committee-men. In addition to these, we required a storekeeper at £1 a-week, and an assistant at 12*s.* The discontinuance of the clothing department has enabled us to discharge five of our officers; so that our paid staff consists now of a secretary and three visitors. Their duties will be heavy enough, as in Dukinfield we avoid one of the sources of discontent mentioned above, we keep no one waiting for his relief; each family receives it on a Tuesday morning, delivered at their own door. Then as to the amount: until last week our scale of relief was as follows:

For a single person	3*s.* 0*d.*
Married couple	6 0
Ditto, with one child	7 6
Ditto, with two children	10 0
Ditto, with three children	12 6

increasing at the rate of 2*s.* for every additional child, affording an average of 2*s.* 5*d.* In addition to this, coals at the rate of 1 cwt. per cottage were distributed.

The liberation of adults from the schools would have been in direct violation of our compact with the Central Committee.

The admission of persons having a direct interest in relief, either as shopkeepers or recipients, had from the first institution of the body been disallowed.

These explanations were freely given to all inquirers, whether singly or in deputations; but yet the discontent prevailed. In one adult school there was open mutiny; and on the teacher remonstrating with the men, his life was threatened, and it become our painful duty to commit three of the offenders to gaol, in default of providing security to keep the peace. Our rule has always been, that the teacher should have no power to grant leave of absence to scholars in masses. In spite of our rule, the superintendents in two of our schools granted holidays, and accompanied the truants in their rambles. The Committee determined to deduct half a day's pay; and the result was, that when our Treasurer and the Secretary presented themselves at one of the schools to pay the weekly allowance, they were advised by a teacher that it would not be safe for them to enter. He said that he had been trying for an hour and a half to quiet them, but they got worse. Very pluckily, however, they pushed their way in, and were received with yells and execrations. After a long and stormy discussion, the class consented to receive their pay, minus the deduction. This scene was repeated.

As a further illustration of the changed temper of the people, it may be mentioned that a deputation waited upon the Relief Committee last Monday; and on being told that our funds had run out, that we were unable from public sources to meet our week's liabilities, the spokesman informed us, that if the Manchester Central Committee had refused to supply us, it was clear that we had been misconducting ourselves.

And now for the cause of all this mischief. I would fain speak with every respect of the clergy and of ministers of religion, and I know that

many of them hereabouts have been faithful to their duty, and whilst comforting have counselled wisely their distressed neighbours; but this cannot be said of all; some half a dozen of them have industriously instilled discontent amongst our well cared-for-population; only three of them, however, have ventured publicly on the scene. These are the Rev. Joseph Reyner Stephens, formerly a Methodist minister, aided by the incumbent of Christchurch, Ashton, the Rev. Mr. Williams, and the incumbent of St. Mark's, Dukinfield, the Rev. Mr. Heffil.

Mr. Stephens is well known as an agitator in this district, and paid the penalty of his misdeeds in times gone by in Chester Castle.

Mr. Williams has brought discredit on the town of Ashton by unseemly squabbles with brother clergymen, and by his recommendation to a crowded meeting of operatives to duck the members of the Dukinfield Relief Committee in a horse pond, because they declined companionship with Mr. Heffil.

Of Mr. Heffil it may be sufficient to say that he has received a reprimand from his Bishop for his conduct in reference to the relief of the operatives, and that he revenged himself by the use of such language in a public meeting as has probably never before been used by a clergyman to his diocesan.

But for these mischievous men, I believe that the workpeople would have continued to receive gratefully and patiently the assistance which has been so benevolently offered to them by all classes of their fellow-countrymen, and that they would have refrained from disparaging the services of their fellow-townsmen who have undertaken the laborious duty of distribution. That many still cherish warm feelings of gratitude both to donors and distributors, I know well and am happy to record; and for their sakes I sincerely hope that the time may not arrive when the members of Relief Committees may have to throw up their nearly thankless office, and leave the recipients to be dealt with by the Board of Guardians.

On the 7th of March, a large meeting was held in the market-place, Ashton. The Rev. Mr. Williams declined to preside, but wrote a letter, from which I make the following extract. It should be borne in mind that the writer has for many months been in the receipt of princely contributions from all parts of the country; and that he lives in a district where the rate of relief has been unusually high, quite equal to the ordinary wants of the working people. He writes—

"You want more money while you are prevented from having that work which you are willing and able to do. You want, what I know you need, more of the necessaries and more of the comforts of life meanwhile for yourselves and your families. That is, you want *help*, you want *more sympathy and assistance from all classes of the community*."

The following extracts from addresses of the Rev. Mr. Stephens may be considered a fair sample of his oratory:

"You workmen, at all events, are not answerable for the idleness,—the idleness! which drives you to the parish and the relief-board. Why, then, should they treat you with all this disrespect and cruelty? Why should you be told that you have no right to what you must either have or die? Why should they brand the clothes you must either wear or go naked? Do those garments belong to you or to them? Are you serfs, or thieves, or vagabonds, that your wives and daughters cannot draw on a stocking or tie a petticoat, or cover their newborn offspring,

without a blush of shame when they look at the infamous brand that is stamped upon every article of their apparel? And, as if it were not enough thus to mark you as the farmer marks his sheep, they swear at you, and curse you, and blast you, and tell you you may go to hell. This cannot be, ought not to be, put up with."

"I have not broken silence for the purpose of directing attention to the malpractices of a single committee. That one committee, it is true, must be remodelled, or Stalybridge will soon find work for the authorities of a very different kind from that of distributing old clothes and tickets for soup. Trousers like these (exhibiting two pair of ragged worn-out trousers) are not the garments which ought to have been given to factory operatives, whose own garments are hanging in rags."

"Mr. Bright, in the last speech he made, said no working man in this country could provide for old age. If that was so, the obstacles ought to be removed, for the labourer should be the first partaker, not of the roots and husks, but of the fruits of industry. As he told them at Lees, Englishmen ought to live on three B's—bread, beef and beer. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) If the labourer could not do that, then he (Mr. Stephens) had no right to mustard, or Indian pickles, or to ride in a cab. Neither prince nor peer ought to have a farthing if the labourer was not to have an adequate return for his labour.—(Applause.) As old Oastler used to say, he was for the throne, the altar, and the cottage. The labourer ought to be as contented in his cottage as the Queen on her throne, as the nobles in their palaces, and as the gentlemen of Oldham in their mansions. Why should they be watched into a beer-house or public-house to see if they bought a pennyworth of 'pankey,' or a pennyworth of 'bold fours'? Was that done in Oldham? (Yes.) Did they complain of it?—(Yes.) Was it 'gradely'?—(No.) Would they stand it?—(No.) They might ask, would he allow them to drink, and he replied that he would. Yet he honoured a teetotaller, and would persuade no one to drink. He would rather encourage every one to try the experiment; but if they thought a glass did them good, let them have it, not pankey, but their wives' genuine home-brewed. Let it be such as made their fathers look like real Englishmen, like regular Oldham 'roughyeds,' with breasts like a door-mat, and their shirt collars thrown back."

Mr. Heffil's orations have less point, but if possible more abuse. The result of the agitation is a demand for more money, and, on the other hand, the Manchester Committee requires a reduction in the rates of relief. The necessity for reduction is based upon their calculation that the funds in hand will only last three months, whilst the destitution will probably last much longer.

We have met their views by the adoption of the following rate. As compared with our former scale it will appear scanty, and will severely tax the managing powers of many a housewife.

For 1 person	3*s.* 6*d.*	per week.
,, 2 ditto	5 6	,,
,, 3 ditto	7 0	or 7*s.* 6*d.*, according to age.
,, 4 ditto	9 0	
,, 5 ditto	10 6	
,, 6 ditto	12 0	
,, 7 ditto	13 6	
,, 8 ditto	15 0	
,, 9 ditto	16	6 the highest sum for any family.

We have also been compelled to strike off our relief list all persons not connected with the cotton trade, but we include colliers, mechanics and washerwomen. It would be unwise to continue to subsidize at this season of the year artizans connected with the building trade.

I conclude with our last week's balance-sheet, which requires this remark: we have not received our coal account, which will probably be £15. If this had been brought forward, instead of having a balance in our favour, we should be in debt to the Treasurer.

Receipts.

	£.	s.	d.
Lord Mayor's Committee ...	12,085	0	0
Manchester ,,	5,095	14	0
Liverpool ,,	50	0	0
Local Subscriptions	1,020	7	4
Friends' Committee	100	0	0
Provisions	298	16	0
	£18,649	17	4

Expenditure.

	£.	s.	d.
Accounts paid ending 51st week	18,112	10	2
Relief in kind to 1764 applts., average 6640 persons ...	224	10	6
Sewing Classes, 1078 women	131	13	6
Adult ditto, 1208 young men	123	13	6
School Pence, 1414 children	17	2	2
News Rooms, 1414 members	1	15	8
Salaries, Stationery, &c. ...	13	17	0
Coal, Cartage, &c.	2	0	6
Clothing	3	18	6
Clogs.....	17	2	2
Balance.....	1	13	8
	£18,649	17	4

It must not be supposed from my report that we have any difficulty in finding really deserving objects of relief, who receive gratefully the contributions which our kind friends have entrusted to us.

I have to acknowledge the following:

Hackney Congregation (February and March)	£40	0	0
Master and Miss Nettlefold.....	1	0	0
F. M. Swanage.....	0	5	0
T. Richmond, Esq., Stockton	1	0	0
Rev. H. Hawkes, Portsea Congregation	5	0	0
E. R., Birmingham	10	0	0

James Heywood, Esq., the *Daily News.*

Dukinfield, March 16, 1863. ALFRED ASPLAND.

POSTSCRIPT, March 24.

My letter was written more than a week ago, and now in the deplorable rioting in this district is accomplished the purpose of the agitators whose speeches and writing I have chronicled. For five days life and property have been at the mercy of roughs from Stalybridge, chiefly Irish, who, by dividing themselves into parties, have baffled the authorities. I am happy to say that in Dukinfield, the feeling amongst the greater part of the workpeople is perfectly loyal, but a hundred or two of ruffianly boys from the neighbouring township are sufficient to excite the spirit of mischief incident to all imperfectly educated communities, and to create a dangerous riot.

We have to trust to our own resources; the Stalybridge authorities dare not part with a single soldier. I am happy to say that our Cheshire constables are a magnificent body of men, and, armed with cutlasses, prove formidable customers. We have with forty constables this afternoon dispersed with great ease a mob of several thousands, who were

looting the shops; our special constables, a hundred strong, guarding the top of the main street to prevent a flank attack.

The county constabulary is commanded by Captain Smith, who has infused his own spirit into the men, his deputy, Mr. Little, possessing rare qualities of nerve and discretion. I saw him ride into a mob and arrest a man, pinning him with his horse against a wall until assistance arrived. The prisoner proved to be a Dukinfield man in good work, surly but honest, and was after a short imprisonment set at liberty. We have seven prisoners in custody on the charge of rioting. How we shall go on for the next week it is impossible to say; there are large numbers of people in Stalybridge who are trusting to pillage for their daily bread; the Relief Committee is firm and they are obstinate. They are supported in their own township at least by the clergy,* some of whom are, without doubt, perfectly conscientious, but who betray a lamentable want of judgment in their speeches and letters, encouraging the people in their sense of wrong, and rendering the dispute incapable of amicable settlement.

A silly person from Bradford, named Bridges, said to be a medical man, has been over here, gobe-mouche, has picked up all sorts of ridiculous stories, sent them to the *Times*, and probably helped us into our present difficulties. He is said to be well-meaning, and this perhaps is the most that can be said of him.

BIRTH OF A CHILD.

A CHILD is born! a blessed gift is given,
Wrapt in the lovely light of infancy;
It comes in all the purity of heaven—
Preserve its purity!

Deal with it gently, in all tenderness;
Let that white tablet not be stained with sin;
Protect it from all darkness, all distress,
Above—around—within.

Too soon the storm-winds and the heavy rain
Will rage and rattle round; too soon the strife
Of passion will perplex the troubled brain,
And cares entangle life.

Between the peaceful cradle and the tomb,
Which is unbroken peace,—what turbulence,
What troubles and what trials are the doom
Of man's inheritance!

Yet sweet it is to think that as in bliss
The mortal history of life began,
A life more blissful still shall follow this—
The coronal of man!

JOHN BOWRING.

---

* Of course I do not include the Rev. Mr. Stephens amongst the clergy.

OBITUARY.

THE LATE REV. JOHN BRIGGS.

The subject of the present notice was born at York in the year 1792, and was from an early age connected with the General Baptist church. At the age of twenty he entered the Christian ministry at Selby, where he continued to labour with much acceptance till the year 1822, when he accepted an invitation to become the pastor of the General Baptist church at Bessell's Green, near Sevenoaks, in Kent. At this place, in addition to the performance of his ministerial duties, he engaged in tuition, and succeeded in gaining the confidence of many persons whose religious opinions differed from his own; he was esteemed by them as a sound instructor of youth; and by his urbanity and goodness of heart maintained the character of a Christian gentleman.

Strongly as he advocated the peculiar doctrine of the General Baptist church, of which he was for some years a messenger, Mr. Briggs was a stranger to narrowness of mind. The business of his life was to preach Christ, not as the patron of a sect, but as the regenerator of men's hearts; and it is a fact pleasing to record that there are many who are now grown up to man's and woman's estate, and some who have passed from the earthly to the heavenly country, who trace their conversion and building up in Christ to Mr. Briggs' teachings and moral influence. Mr. Briggs' ministry at Bessell's Green extended from 1822 to 1850, when, on his resignation, he was succeeded by his son, the Rev. J. A. Briggs, who is now elder of the Unitarian Baptist church at Headcorn. In 1853 he removed to Dover, where he continued to reside until his decease. For several years he was an active member of the Dover Municipal Corporation, only occasionally officiating in the pulpit at this or any other place. The last occasion on which he preached was in November last at Dover, when his text was, "We do all fade as a leaf;" and his last public act was to take part in the election of Mayor.

For some months prior to his decease, Mr. Briggs' health was manifestly declining,—a functional derangement of the stomach, too stubborn for medicine to remove, prevented his receiving the nourishment nature requires; and in the early part of January, by advice of his friends, he paid a visit to his son-in-law at Chatham, in hope that change of air might be of service. In this, however, his family were disappointed; for he gradually sank, until early in the morning of Feb. 1st, he finished his earthly course.

Of his active life, it may be said it was a consistent walk with God; of its close, that it was characterized by a firm faith in God and Christ, and a blessed hope in which there was no fear. Living, he bore testimony to the value of the Unitarian faith as the faith to live by; and when at the very gates of death, he declared it to be the source of unspeakable comfort.

His remains were interred in the family-vault at Bessell's Green on the 7th of Feb., when his old friend Mr. G. C. Pound officiated; and on the 8th, the funeral sermon was delivered in the General Baptist chapel at Dover by the Rev. James Phillips, of Chatham, who had been much with him during his sojourn at that place.

Feb. 10, at Moorlands, EMMA, wife of William Fitchett CUFF, Esq., and daughter of Rev. Edward Whitfield, of Ilminster, in the 48th year of her age.

At an age which to many is full of the activities and interests of life, and from a condition of more than ordinary prosperity, she has been called away. The strongest ties of life have been broken—hopes of her future have been crushed—she has thus submitted to the universal decree. Who shall say that the summons was premature and unkind? Those who lament her departure the most, who feel how immense a loss they have sustained, would not rebel against the decree of separation, but piously behold within the mystery of the visitation both infinite wisdom and love.

Mrs. Cuff was not one of those endowed by nature with robust health. Born with a constitution naturally delicate, more than ordinary care was needed to guard her as her life expanded and her years increased. That care was affectionately extended by parental love, and happily it was not entirely unsuccessful, nor deprived of a portion of its reward. By judicious management her health was protected, and in her maiden life her constitution appeared to gain and not lose strength.

She was happily married—happily to one who both esteemed and loved her, and whose ample means were thought to be well employed in ministering to her comfort and happiness. The union was blessed and the prosperous home adorned with children. But symptoms of failing health began to manifest themselves, which the most anxious care and the most judicious treatment could not dissipate. The progress of disease be-

came more and more apparent, and the hopes of her ultimate restoration to health entertained by her husband and her friends were sadly reduced by the most painful fears.

The final attack was sudden. At a moment when those hopes were regaining some strength, the fatal dart was sped, and all that affection and medical skill could do was to soften the anguish of the wound until the last sleep sealed the eyes of the patient sufferer.

Many tears have been wrung forth by this melancholy dispensation beyond the homes where the departed one was a chief joy and ornament. Known to a large circle of friends, she was as largely admired and loved. Fair of form, she was fairer still in the ornaments of her mind. Prudent, true and good as she was beautiful, sentiments of esteem for her filled the minds of those who were so happy as to know her intimately, and they are among the first to grieve that one so worthy of their admiration and love has been separated from them by an irrevocable decree. As a child dutiful; as a wife faithful; as a mother most tender, yet judicious and firm to guide her children aright,—how significant are these words of measureless loss—loss to an affectionate husband—loss to children in their early girlhood—loss to parents, themselves sinking in the vale of years! How deep their sorrows! But let the veil fall over them—these sorrows are sacred!

Let not the hand of affection be now forbidden to portray the strong religious feeling which disclosed itself dutifully to the gaze of Omniscience whilst it withdrew from human observation. Religion was an essential, rather a prevailing, element of the departed one's disposition. And it was as cheerful as it was influential. Among her treasured thoughts were deep impressions of the paternal character of God, and the affections of the earthly child responded to those of the Heavenly Parent; in his wisdom she felt unbounded confidence; to her his goodness was a very present blessing, and pouring forth continually blessings without number. And thus religion was not an occasional, momentary stimulant, but a uniform principle and feeling that regulated her inmost life—not the noise and flutter of the brawling stream, but the silent, deep flow of the majestic river. Who shall tell what a blessed serenity religion spread over the soul when suffering was intensest and fortitude the most severely tried! No torture wrung a murmur from her lips—none excited a pang of mistrust in her heart. It was the privilege of those who waited near her to behold meekness and resignation triumphing over the excruciating pain that sometimes agitated her countenance. This ruffled it for awhile, and then their sweetness returned and was the abiding charm. Her last earthly moments were serenity itself.

Free earthly communion is now closed; between the loving the bar of separation has fallen. Still, in the quiet scene of her maiden years, and in the family circle which formed itself around her wedded life, Emma Cuff will continue to be the "angel in the house." Affection will find a pensive enjoyment in thinking that she has affections still for those she has left behind. Association will busy itself in connecting her unseen presence with the events and the scenes of the day, with the renewed intercourses of life, with the friends who loved her and were by her beloved; with the rising thoughts of the moment her remembered thoughts will be blended, and a mysterious joy will glance through the breast as she appears to return to husband or parent, bearing some expression of a love which eternity cannot dissolve, and some message from the regions, now her sainted dwelling-place, which are beautified exceedingly by love and virtue and serene bliss. Oh, if her hand shall be the privileged to guide the tender ones to the home it has been her bliss to realize with the Father! Happy they, as yet unconscious of their irreparable loss, if in after years, as they become more acutely sensible of its weight, their mother's virtues shall begin to expand in them, to put forth sweet blossoms, and promise to shed the same calm and holy beauty on domestic life!

Meanwhile religious hope will lend its aid to soften the pangs of separation. The tear of sorrow flows not down the cheek profaned by discontent: the voice of wounded affection rises not into the harsh tones of complaint. God's will be done! He deposited a treasure in loving hands for many years—He has asked for it again. It is stored in the bosom of his love. And He tells those who mourn and weep because they have it not still in their keeping, "Come at your appointed time, and it shall be yours for ever!"

Feb. 27, at Ipswich, Mr. Robert Harmer, aged 78.

March 9, Mary, the beloved wife of Mr. Jonathan Leigh, of Rose Bank, Patricroft.

March 14, aged 13 months, Edward Cole, son of Mr. E. C. Harding, Sedgley Bank, Higher Broughton, Manchester.